



ICOMOS International Scientific Committee
on Twentieth Century Heritage

TWENTIETH-CENTURY HERITAGE PRACTICE SURVEY

Volume I - Report



Copyright

Published by ICOMOS International

<https://www.icomos.org/>

First published 2026

Copyright © 2026 ICOMOS International. This publication is licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0. This license enables reusers to copy and distribute the material in any medium or format in unadapted form only, for noncommercial purposes only, and only if attribution is given to the creator.



ISBN: 978-2-487082-27-4 (Volumes I and II)

ISBN: 978-2-487082-28-1 (Volume I)

ISBN: 978-2-487082-29-8 (Volume II)

Edited by Margherita Pedroni and Sheridan Burke

Cover images (left to right):

Top: Paimio Sanatorium, Finland (Photo by Sheridan Burke), The Grain Silos, South Africa (Photo by Sheridan Burke), Benedictine Monastery, Chile (Photo by Sheridan Burke).

Second row: Sidi Harazem, Morocco (Photo by Sheridan Burke), Faculty of Education, Obafemi Awolowo University in Ile-Ife, Nigeria (Photo courtesy of Adekunle Adeyemo, 2021. Licence: CC BY-SA 4.0), Abu Dhabi Central Bus Station, United Arab Emirates (Photo by Margherita Pedroni).

Third row: Salk Institute, United States of America (Photo by Sheridan Burke), Habitat '67, Canada (Photo by Sheridan Burke), Barbican Estate, United Kingdom (Photo by Sheridan Burke).

Fourth row: Robben Island, South Africa (Photo by Sheridan Burke); Ghandi Bhawan, India (Photo by Margherita Pedroni), Boa Nova Tea House, Portugal (Photo by Margherita Pedroni).

Bottom: Yoyogi National Stadium, Japan (Photo by Sheridan Burke), Abu Dhabi Central Bus Station, Saudi Arabia (Photo by Adnan AlJaber), Sydney Opera House, Australia (Photo by Lindy Kerr).

Acknowledgements

We thank all the members of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage (ISC20C) Working Group for their commitment and contributions to this initiative.

Working Group Co-Leads are Sheridan Burke and Margherita Pedroni. Working Group members include Carolina Chaves, Giacomo Martinis, Grethe Pontoppidan, Juliano Carvalho, Mariana Isa, Nityaa Lakshmi Iyer, Santiago Beckdorf, and Susan Macdonald. Their efforts are warmly appreciated.

The authors sincerely thank all the National Committees and members who responded and contributed to completing the survey. Their considerable time and effort enabled this survey to provide valuable insights into current trends and practices, helping to inform the future work of ISC20C.

The authors also extend their gratitude to Elsa Haarstad for her thoughtful review and valuable feedback on the draft report, and to Marita Smith for her careful copyediting.

Table of Contents

Foreword	5
Executive Summary	7
List of Abbreviations	12
1. Introduction	13
1.1 Background	13
1.2 Scope and Aims	18
1.3 Methodology	19
1.4 Survey Analysis and Interpretation	22
1.5 Survey Limitations	22
2. Identification and Documentation of Twentieth-Century Heritage Places	25
2.1 Introduction	25
2.2 Summary of Responses	25
2.3 Key Findings	35
3. Legal Protection of Twentieth-Century Heritage Places	38
3.1 Introduction	38
3.2 Summary of Responses	38
3.3 Key Findings	52
4. Use of the Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework	55
4.1 Introduction	55
4.2 Summary of Responses	55
4.3 Key Findings	62
5. Use of the Madrid–New Delhi Document	64
5.1 Introduction	64
5.2 Summary of Responses	64
5.3 Key Findings	70
6. Looking Back: Evolution and Changes Since 2000	72
6.1 Introduction	72
6.2 Summary of Responses	72
6.3 Key Findings	82
7. Looking Ahead: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities	84
7.1 Introduction	84
7.2 Summary of Responses	84
7.3 Key Findings	107
8. Conclusions	110
Appendices	112
Appendix I: MAP20 Project Summary 2005	112
Appendix II: HPS20 Questionnaire and Glossary 2024	120
Appendix III: HPS20 Respondents	133

Appendix IV: References and Links to Inventories	136
Appendix V: References and Links to the Heritage Lists	144
Appendix VI: References and Links to National Heritage Criteria	147
Appendix VII: References to Key Information on National Legal Protection	153
Appendix VIII: Five Youngest Twentieth-Century Heritage Places Listed	158
Appendix IX: Reference Documents, Guidelines, Best Practices and Standards	191
Appendix X: Publications or Websites	201
Appendix XI: Civic, National or Local Groups	215
Appendix XII: Guidance Documents on Heritage and Sustainability	225

Foreword

Over the past two decades, the conservation of twentieth-century heritage has evolved from a nascent field into a recognized area of heritage practice in its own right. This report presents the findings of the Twentieth-Century Heritage Practice Survey (HPS20), undertaken in 2024–2025 by the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage (ISC20C), and represents a comprehensive international assessment of this field since the Montreal Action Plan 20 (known as the MAP20 survey) was carried out by the ISC20C in the early 2000s.

The intent of the HPS20 was twofold. First, it sought to take stock of how twentieth-century heritage is currently identified, protected, and managed across diverse national and regional contexts. Second, it aimed to reflect critically on how far the principles, tools, and guidance developed by ISC20C over the past twenty years—including the *Madrid–New Delhi Document* and the *Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework*—have been understood, disseminated, and applied in practice. In doing so, the survey provides both a measure of progress and reveals the challenges that continue to shape this field.

The breadth of engagement reflected in the survey responses underscores the growing maturity of twentieth-century heritage practice worldwide. At the same time, the findings remind us that recognition alone does not equate to effective conservation. Persistent disparities in institutional capacity, legal frameworks, technical guidance, and public awareness continue to expose twentieth-century heritage to loss and irreversible change. The survey also highlights the degree to which conservation practice remains reactive, often responding only when places are under immediate threat, rather than being grounded in systematic identification, strategic planning, and proactive policy integration.

As Presidents of ISC20C during the period in which this survey was undertaken, we are particularly encouraged by the survey’s identification of emerging opportunities. The increasing alignment between heritage conservation, sustainability, and climate action offers a compelling framework for reinforcing the relevance of twentieth-century heritage within contemporary societal debates. Equally important is the growing willingness of National Committees, civil society organisations, and international networks to collaborate, exchange knowledge, and develop shared approaches to common challenges.

This report is not intended as a definitive statement, nor as an endpoint. Rather, it is offered as a resource and a foundation for future action—one that can support reflection, dialogue, and strategic decision-making within ISC20C and across the wider ICOMOS community. It is our hope that the findings presented here will stimulate renewed commitment to strengthening identification and documentation, advancing

conservation knowledge, and embedding twentieth-century heritage more firmly within legal, planning, and sustainability frameworks worldwide.

We would like to express our thanks to the National Committees, contributors, and colleagues who contributed their time, expertise, and resources to this survey. To our hardworking Working Group members, Carolina Chaves, Giacomo Martinis, Juliano Carvalho, Mariana Isa, Nityaa Lakshmi Iyer, and Santiago Beckdorf, we express our sincere appreciation for the incredible work you have done to bring this to fruition. To our highly capable co-leads, Sheridan Burke and Margherita Pedroni, we offer our huge thanks for the significant effort this has entailed, their persistence in the face of the various challenges such a visionary exercise involved, and their dedication to the task.

As ISC20C enters its third decade, the insights gained through the HPS20 provide a timely and valuable basis for shaping our future priorities and responsibilities. We look forward to seeing how our field continues to evolve in the decades ahead.

Grethe Pontoppidan and Susan Macdonald

Co-Presidents ICOMOS ISC20C
January 2026

Executive Summary

The Twentieth-Century Heritage Practice Survey (HPS20) was an initiative undertaken in 2024 and 2025 by the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage (ISC20C) to provide an international overview of how twentieth-century heritage is currently identified, protected, and managed.

Conceived as a follow-up to the MAP20 survey undertaken between 2001 and 2005, the HPS20 set out to assess how far the field has progressed over the intervening two decades, and to identify current challenges, opportunities, and priorities for future action by ISC20C, including climate change as a topic of inquiry. The survey invited ICOMOS National Committees to provide an overview of heritage practice related to the conservation of the heritage of the twentieth century, and to evaluate awareness and use of two key ISC20C documents: the *Madrid–New Delhi Document* (MNDD) and the *Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework* (TCHTF). The survey also resulted in the collection of a substantial body of pertinent references and resources contributed by National Committees, including inventories, surveys, policy documents, and scholarly publications. Together, these materials constitute valuable shared resources for future research, comparative analysis, and the exchange of good practices across regions, providing an important foundation for further international collaboration and knowledge development on twentieth-century heritage conservation.

The survey was distributed online through the ICOMOS National Committees network and received a total of 63 responses, representing a broad geographical and cultural range.

Taken as a whole, the findings reveal a field that has matured significantly since the early 2000s, yet it remains vulnerable. The legacy of the twentieth century is today far more widely recognized as heritage than it was at the time of the MAP20 survey, and in many countries, it is now included within conservation frameworks. However, at the same time, the survey highlights deep and persistent disparities between countries and regions, uneven institutional capacity, and an enduring gap between documentation, recognition, and effective conservation. In some contexts, a lack of public awareness, appreciation, and political will requires further advocacy and action.

Identification and documentation

The survey findings confirmed the importance of sound identification and documentation as the foundational stages in the conservation of twentieth-century heritage. While most countries have undertaken surveys or studies of twentieth-century places, these are frequently partial, incomplete, uncoordinated, or thematically narrow. Comprehensive, systematic inventories comparable to those developed for earlier periods of heritage remain rare, and they are largely led by the initiative of

specialist volunteer organizations, academic institutions, or individual experts. As a result, many twentieth-century heritage places remain unidentified until they are under immediate threat, at which point assessment is reactive rather than proactive.

In addition, the frequent integration of twentieth-century sites into broader heritage databases—without adequate chronological, typological, or thematic filtering—limits the ability for research to analyze data patterns, monitor trends, or develop targeted policies. Many survey responses reported administrative fragmentation, with no integrated or inter-operable heritage registers across different levels of governance, further exacerbating the identification problem.

Typological, stylistic, biographical, and chronological approaches to identification remain dominant, while thematic studies—capable of revealing broader social, technological, and cultural processes—are used slightly less often. This finding suggests that further work is needed to demonstrate and promote the values of taking a thematic approach to identification studies.

The survey identified many good practices and valuable identification and documentation initiatives for twentieth-century heritage with clear potential as international case studies; however, these examples are not yet widely disseminated or easily accessible, limiting opportunities for sharing lessons learned and knowledge exchange.

Legal protection

In terms of legal protection of twentieth-century heritage, the survey responses indicated substantial progress since the 2005 MAP20 survey. Many countries have revised legislation, lowered age thresholds, or introduced exceptions to allow the listing of a broader range of places of outstanding significance even when they have not yet reached the age threshold. Increased historical distance from the twentieth century has also contributed to broader acceptance and reduced controversy, particularly for places dating from the earlier decades of the century. However, almost half of the responses reported the existence of legal criteria or regulatory constraints that continue to impact listing or prevent the protection of twentieth-century heritage places in their country, most commonly age-based thresholds.

The survey highlighted the critical role played by non-governmental actors in addressing these gaps. Civil society organizations, specialist advocacy groups, and international networks have been instrumental in promoting listings, raising awareness, and responding to threats. Initiatives such as ISC20C's Heritage Alerts program demonstrate the power of coordinated advocacy, but they also expose its limitations. Reactive campaigns, while often effective in the short term, are resource-intensive and cannot substitute for proactive planning, robust identification systems, and well-integrated legal frameworks.

Nonetheless, listing alone does not guarantee effective conservation outcomes will result. This is sometimes due to weak enforcement, lagging public support, inadequate regulatory tools, and limited financial incentives. This is particularly problematic for a heritage category characterized by the sheer number and large scale of twentieth-century sites.

Responses noted an increasingly strong link between heritage conservation and sustainability rationale, particularly regarding embodied energy, carbon reduction, and the environmental benefits of retention and adaptive reuse. This growing alignment is strengthening the case for conserving twentieth-century heritage within broader sustainable development and climate policy frameworks.

Use of ISC20C guidance documents

One of the aims of the survey was to assess awareness and use of two key ISC20C documents: the *Madrid–New Delhi Document* (MNDD) and the *Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework* (TCHTF). The findings revealed that both documents are widely regarded as valuable, yet they would both benefit from more promotion and dissemination to ensure widespread understanding and application.

While most responses considered the TCHTF and its themes relevant, more than half reported that it has not yet been used in their national context. Responses called for further guidance, capacity-building, practical examples of its application, and promotion to support its dissemination and implementation.

Similarly, the MNDD is widely recognized as an important international practice reference document. The survey findings suggested that workshops, seminars, case studies, visual materials, and promotion at the national level could significantly enhance the reach and usefulness of both documents.

Looking back: evolution over the last 20 years

One of the clearest conclusions to emerge from the survey is that awareness and appreciation of twentieth-century heritage have increased substantially over the past two decades. This shift is also reflected in the growing inclusion of twentieth-century heritage in surveys, studies, and inventories, indicating a broader cultural change in how recent heritage is understood and valued. Compared to the situation documented in the MAP20 survey, twentieth-century heritage is now less frequently dismissed as “too recent” or “not historic enough,” and, in many contexts, is increasingly acknowledged as an important component of the continuum of national heritage narratives.

This shift has been supported by several mutually reinforcing developments: the expansion of academic research and teaching incorporating twentieth-century architecture and landscapes; and the growing community role and influence of civil society organizations, specialist groups, and international networks such as DOCOMOMO and ICOMOS. The increasing inclusion of modern heritage on the World Heritage List has also played an important role in legitimizing twentieth-century heritage at national and local levels and in stimulating wider public interest. This is further supported by the gradual passage of time, which has made earlier phases of the century eligible for statutory protection under age-based criteria.

However, the survey makes clear that progress has been uneven. In some countries, identification and protection systems are well established, coordinated, and supported by public authorities. In others, the systems are still nascent, or efforts remain sporadic and fragmented. Even where legislative frameworks have been updated or expanded, their implementation is often constrained by limited resources, administrative fragmentation, or declining political support for heritage protection more generally.

Survey responses indicate that conservation guidelines specific to twentieth-century heritage remain insufficient, and technical resources are relatively underdeveloped. While a substantial body of references on the history of twentieth-century heritage exists, relatively fewer resources address technical aspects of conservation practice, and although case studies demonstrate good practices, accessing this type of documentation specific to twentieth-century heritage can prove difficult.

Looking ahead: vulnerability amid opportunity

Perhaps the most striking finding of the survey is the paradox it reveals. Twentieth-century heritage is more widely recognized, studied, and appreciated than ever before, yet it remains acutely vulnerable. Urban development pressures, insufficient financial resources, and incompatible alterations were consistently identified as the most pressing threats in the survey responses.

At the same time, the survey identified significant opportunities. Generational shifts in perception, rising public interest, and increasing alignment between heritage conservation and sustainability agendas are generally strengthening the case for conservation action over demolition. Adaptive reuse projects, awareness campaigns, and international knowledge exchange are gaining momentum. There is significant potential to disseminate lessons learned and adaptable examples of good practice more widely.

There is strong demand for technical guidance, especially research on modern materials conservation and case studies addressing retrofitting, reuse, code compliance, and climate adaptation.

The survey was also an opportunity to inquire about the impacts and effects of climate change on the conservation of twentieth-century heritage. This emerged as a key challenge for the future of twentieth-century heritage. Responses reported worsening material deterioration, increased exposure to environmental risks, and widespread incompatible interventions associated with required energy-efficiency upgrades. Despite growing recognition of the importance of embodied carbon and whole-life thinking, very few countries have developed guidance or strategies that explicitly address the vulnerabilities of twentieth-century heritage.

List of Abbreviations

APT	Association for Preservation Technology
CIVVIH	ICOMOS International Committee on Historic Towns and Villages
DOCOMOMO	Documentation and Conservation of buildings, sites, and neighborhoods of the Modern Movement
ICCROM	International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
ISCCL	ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes
ISCES+CC	ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Energy, Sustainability and Climate Change
MNDD	Madrid–New Delhi Document
TCHTF	Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework
TICCIH	The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage
UIA	International Union of Architects

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Toward the turn of the millennium, concern about the conservation of the heritage places of the twentieth century was intensifying. Whilst conferences and expert meetings on modern heritage had increased in the 1980s and 1990s, there was a lack of accurate knowledge globally as to how potentially significant places of the century were being identified, protected and managed.

Calls for national and, increasingly, international advocacy for modern sites coming under threat were growing. In 2000, ICOMOS's inaugural *Heritage at Risk*¹ report, compiled from data supplied by its National and Scientific Committees, confirmed that twentieth-century heritage was particularly at risk due to a lack of recognition and protection. ICOMOS began to consider its own role within the international network of organizations emerging to support the protection of twentieth-century heritage.

An expert working group (EWG) was appointed by ICOMOS in 2001 “to reflect on ways ICOMOS can play a significant role in support of the understanding, protection, and proper care of twentieth-century heritage in its full diversity, taking into account the unique nature of its international network and the partnerships.”²

The same year, UNESCO's World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, and DOCOMOMO launched the Programme on Modern Heritage to examine its identification, documentation, and promotion. The programme included five global meetings: Mexico (2002), India (2003), Eritrea (2003), USA (2004), and Egypt (2005).³

Meanwhile, ICOMOS was also developing a report for the World Heritage Committee, examining the representativity, balance, and credibility of the World Heritage List. *The World Heritage List: Filling the Gaps*⁴ report was eventually published in 2005. It highlighted the inadequate representation of modern heritage on the World Heritage List—only 1% of the over 700 places then listed were identified as modern heritage, and some regions, notably the Asia Pacific, had no modern sites listed at all, nor on tentative lists.

1 Dinu Bumbaru, Sheridan Burke, Michaël Petzet, and Marilyn Truscott, eds., *Heritage at Risk: ICOMOS World Report 2000 on Monuments and Sites in Danger* (ICOMOS, 2000), <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000148837>

2 Dinu Bumbaru, ed., *Defining an ICOMOS Action Plan for Twentieth Century Heritage: Report to ICOMOS Advisory Committee* (ICOMOS, 2001).

3 R. van Oers and S. Haraguchi, eds., *Identification and Documentation of Modern Heritage* (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2003).

4 ICOMOS, *The World Heritage List: Filling the Gaps—An Action Plan for the Future* (ICOMOS, 2005), <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000231990>

Meeting in Canada in September 2001, the ICOMOS EWG developed the *Montreal Action Plan 20* (MAP20), which initiated a survey of all ICOMOS National and Scientific Committees to identify the major practical issues affecting the identification and protection of twentieth-century heritage places. The MAP20 also hoped to provoke action and engagement from National Committees to work towards local and national protection of twentieth-century places and to consider potential tentative World Heritage listings of twentieth-century properties. It was intended that a database and a publication would result from the MAP20 survey, and that its outcome would help ICOMOS assess the need to establish an ICOMOS International Scientific Committee (ISC) on twentieth-century heritage and devise its work plan.

The MAP20 survey asked eight key questions and eventually elicited responses from 51 ICOMOS committees and international members. The information collected included an overview of the statutory protection, conservation, and public appreciation of twentieth-century places in various countries, a list of over 600 sites, and a bibliography of relevant resources. Results were predictably uneven regionally (aligned with where ICOMOS National Committees were then active), and responses were predominantly from European National Committees, with few from African and Asian National Committees, and responses from the Arab States were notably absent (see Table 1.1).

ICOMOS Region	Responses to MAP20
Africa	4
Arab States	0
Asia and the Pacific	7
Europe	29
America	11

Table 1.1: Number of MAP20 survey responses received per region.

The preliminary findings of the MAP20 survey (based on the responses of the just 19 ICOMOS Committees which had by then been received) were presented at the 2002 ICOMOS GA Scientific Symposium in Madrid by ISC20C member Sandra Uskokovic.⁵ Three years later, a total of 51 committees had responded to the MAP20 survey, and the results were summarized in an unpublished internal ICOMOS report dated 2005 (Appendix I). The final report generally confirmed the preliminary survey findings, concluding that:

- the identification and protection of twentieth-century places was weak at every level of government, including world heritage listing;
- the criteria for assessment and approaches to conservation for modern heritage lacked clarity;
- poor public awareness and weak political support were widespread;

⁵ Sandra Uskokovic, *ICOMOS Action Plan on 20th Century Heritage/Survey* (ICOMOS, 2002).

- opportunities for collaborations and partnerships—local and international—were evident;
- the breadth of the typologies of twentieth-century heritage places—far beyond architectural icons—was increasingly but inconsistently recognized;
- thematic approaches and regional initiatives were emerging;
- practical doctrinal guidance and principles for modern heritage practice were desired at all levels;
- access to documentation, resources, references, case studies, and best practice examples was sought after; and
- ICOMOS needed to become a heritage advocate for the heritage places of the twentieth century, with post-WWII sites increasingly profiled in annual ICOMOS *Heritage at Risk* reports.

Together, the results of the MAP20 survey, the *Heritage at Risk* annual reports, the outcomes of the UNESCO Modern Heritage Programme, and the ICOMOS *World Heritage List: Filling the Gaps* report, all effectively confirmed the need for ICOMOS to establish an International Scientific Committee on twentieth-century heritage, with a defined work program, to work alongside and in partnership with organizations such as DOCOMOMO, the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH), and the International Union of Architects (UIA).

An enthusiastic group of ICOMOS members formed an Interim Management Committee (IMC)⁶, meeting at the General Assembly in Xi'an, China in 2005. The IMC began to prepare statutes and a draft work program. The establishment of the International Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage (ISC20C) was approved by the ICOMOS Executive Committee, and it held its first elections in 2008. The MAP20 survey's findings framed the key components of its first approved work plan.

The new committee was quickly asked to provide technical advice to the ICOMOS World Heritage Unit on issues arising from new nominations and on the state of conservation reporting for several twentieth-century sites. The ISC20C organized a series of World Heritage advisory seminars from 2008 to 2015 to engage members and ICOMOS World Heritage advisers in discussions and to provide direct advice to ICOMOS as modern heritage site nominations increased, notably the serial nomination for Le Corbusier's work.

⁶ The Interim Management Committee included Christiane Schmuckle Mollard and Sheridan Burke (Co-Presidents), Dr Xavier de Anda Alanis (Mexico) as Vice-President and Treasurer, Gunny Harboe (USA) as Secretary General, Kyle Normandin (USA) as Database, E-Server List and Communications, Susan Macdonald as Drafter of ISC20C Mission Statement (with Kyle Normandin, Stephen Kelley, and Sheridan Burke), Sandra Uskokovic as ongoing Montreal Action Plan 20 Survey Work contact, and Natalia Dushkina as 2006 Moscow Heritage at Risk Conference contact.

To support advocacy efforts for twentieth-century heritage at risk, in 2008, the ISC20C developed and piloted the “Heritage Alerts” (HA) process to respond to member requests for international advocacy action. The first HA (with ICOMOS Sweden, in partnership with DOCOMOMO and UIA) successfully supported the protection of the Gunnar Asplund-designed Stockholm City Library from unsympathetic alteration in 2009. In the period 2009-2015, ISC20C handled 30 Heritage Alerts, usually in partnership with DOCOMOMO and UIA. In 2010, ISC20C assisted in adapting the HA process for general use by ICOMOS committees, and it is now employed globally by ICOMOS committees for all types of heritage at risk and its process serves as the template for formulating resolutions at the ICOMOS General Assembly.

Responding to the need expressed in the MAP20 survey for improved access to documentation, resources, and references, the committee initiated an online *Heritage Toolkit* in 2010, by simply inviting members to provide examples of good heritage practice tools that they used professionally—such as policies, guidelines, case studies, etc.—which they would recommend to colleagues. The ISC20C online *Heritage Toolkit*⁷ made them electronically accessible via hyperlinks or PDFs, for use or adaptation by ISC20C members, heritage practitioners, communities, and broader audiences.

The committee also initiated an ambitious project to broaden the recognition of twentieth-century heritage places beyond the architectural icons that were then dominating the modern places proposed for national listing and for the tentative World Heritage List. The objective was to scope and promote the breadth of types of potentially significant places—for example, buildings, industrial sites, landscapes, and infrastructure—created in the twentieth century that contribute to its heritage. Responding directly to the MAP20 survey’s findings and the emergence of thematic approaches in several countries, this ambitious project began by examining the historical themes of development that characterized the twentieth century and identifying examples of the places, structures, landscapes, etc., within those themes, thus creating a framework for local adaptation in developing surveys and documentation work.

The project began slowly in 2008 and gained traction with sponsorship from the Getty Conservation Institute. An international steering committee guided consultants through several iterations, and the framework was published in French, English, and Spanish in 2021 as the *Twentieth-Century Heritage Thematic Framework* (TCHTF).⁸ In 2022, the framework was presented to the ICOMOS Advisory Committee, which recommended that the Board “recognize the Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework as a key reference document for expanding understanding, identification,

⁷ ICOMOS, *ISC20C Heritage Toolkit*, <https://isc20c.icomos.org/resources/toolkit/>

⁸ Susan Marsden and Peter Spearritt, eds., *The Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework: A Tool for Assessing Heritage Places* (Getty Conservation Institute, 2021).

and undertaking the assessment of twentieth-century heritage, including for World Heritage nominations.” The framework recognized that global social and political experiences varied regionally and timewise and offered a way of approaching survey work thematically rather than stylistically or chronologically. Between 2020 and 2023, ISC20C and the Getty Conservation Institute organized a series of regional webinars for Africa, the Arab Region, and Europe to introduce the TCHTF.

In response to requests for practical doctrinal guidance and principles, the ISC20C initiated a broad discussion on approaches to the conservation of twentieth-century heritage places. In 2010, the members of the ISC20C began drafting a text to set out the approach and principles to be applied to the management and interpretation of twentieth-century sites and places. The ambitious objective was to provide an international reference statement with practice guidance that could be used at any level.

Lively debates ensued among ISC20C members, drawing on their pragmatic experience from across the world. The final text, *Approaches for the Conservation of Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage*, colloquially called the “Madrid Document,” was presented to the 17th ICOMOS General Assembly in Paris (2011) and distributed in Spanish, French, and English for comment and discussion. Between 2011 and 2014, it was translated into more than a dozen languages, including Russian, Italian, Finnish, German, Japanese, Portuguese, Mandarin, Hindi, Basque, and Catalan, indicating the need for and use of such an international guidance document.

After consideration of comments received, a second edition of *Approaches for the Conservation of Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage* was developed and published in four languages at the 18th ICOMOS General Assembly in Florence (2014). However, it was clear that a major revision—and a new title—was necessary to specifically include all the heritage typologies of the twentieth century, including cultural landscapes, industrial sites, and urban areas. Collaboration with the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes (ISCCL), the ICOMOS International Committee on Historic Towns and Villages (CIVVIH), the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH), and the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Energy, Sustainability and Climate Change (ISCES+CC) resulted in the successful incorporation of the full breadth of twentieth-century heritage places and sites in the final document.

The third version, *Approaches to the Conservation of Twentieth-Century Cultural Heritage*, colloquially called the “Madrid–New Delhi Document” (MNDD),⁹ was endorsed for promotion and dissemination by resolution at the 19th General Assembly of ICOMOS in Delhi in December 2017, incorporating the comments and inputs

⁹ ICOMOS, *Approaches to the Conservation of Twentieth-Century Cultural Heritage: Madrid–New Delhi Document* (ICOMOS, 2017), https://isc20c.icomos.org/policy_items/madrid-new-delhi-doc/

received during the 2014-17 consultation period. It has now been translated into 19 languages and is available on the ISC20C website.

The ISC20C has also collaborated on a range of technical research projects, including the development of guidance principles on the conservation of twentieth-century concrete heritage, based on the concepts of the MNDD. Published as *The Cadiz Document: InnovaConcrete Guidelines for the Conservation of Concrete Heritage* in 2021, it was part of a research Initiative funded by the European Union (EU) Horizon 2020 and coordinated by the University of Cadiz.

The ISC20C established a website in 2011 and a social media presence on Instagram and Facebook to promote public awareness of its work and the issues impacting twentieth-century places. A review and update of the committee website began in 2025.

The ISC20C has grown to be one of the largest and most active ISCs in ICOMOS, and as it celebrates its second decade, it is timely to review its achievements, the current challenges in the field, and chart its work program ahead.

In 2021, the ISC20C formed a Working Group to revisit the issues raised by the MAP20 survey and to examine the state of conservation action for twentieth-century heritage through the lens of the current experience of the ICOMOS National Committee network. It was also timely to examine the use of the ISC20C's two key publications: the MNDD (2017) and the TCHTF (2021). The Working Group named the initiative the *Twentieth-Century Heritage Practice Survey* (HPS20), and it is the focus of this publication.

1.2 Scope and Aims

The focus of the survey was twentieth-century heritage, for which ISC20C adopts a broad definition—encompassing all forms of cultural heritage—both tangible and intangible. This includes buildings and other man-made structures, urban ensembles and planning schemes, cultural landscapes, and industrial and archaeological sites, among others.

Although this survey focused on twentieth-century heritage, the report acknowledges that this field exists within the broader continuum of heritage practice. Twentieth-century heritage presents specific challenges and opportunities, but it should not be treated in isolation or through a separate practice framework from other heritage places. The goal of the survey was to obtain responses focused on this specific period as much as possible to help identify current challenges and specific initiatives needed now to support the care and management of twentieth-century heritage places.

The HPS20 aimed to:

- gather up-to-date information on the state of conservation of twentieth-century heritage places worldwide;
- identify and document current good practices to be shared for the benefit of the wider heritage community looking after twentieth-century heritage;
- identify current issues and needs affecting the conservation of twentieth-century heritage;
- synthesize these results to identify patterns and trends to understand where progress has been made since the MAP20 survey in 2001 and where gaps remain; and
- identify potential actions to address these needs, and report to the ISC20C Board so that it may consider how ISC20C can respond most effectively.

1.3 Methodology

From the outset, it was decided that the survey would be addressed to ICOMOS National Committees, with each committee invited to provide a single response offering an overview of twentieth-century heritage conservation in its respective country.

1.3.1 Working Group

All members of ISC20C were invited to participate and contribute actively. The survey was undertaken by a dedicated Working Group composed of volunteer members. The initiative was first announced at the Annual General Meeting (AGM) in Porto in 2022, and subsequently incorporated into the ISC20C Triennial Action Plan, which included a dedicated page on the ISC20C website about the survey. A progress update was subsequently presented at the committee's AGM in Finland in 2024, and its findings were presented at the 2025 AGM in Brazil.

The Working Group Co-Leads were Sheridan Burke and Margherita Pedroni, and the Working Group members include Carolina Chaves, Giacomo Martinis, Grethe Pontoppidan, Juliano Carvalho, Mariana Isa, Nityaa Lakshmi Iyer, Santiago Beckdorf, and Susan Macdonald.

1.3.2 Survey questions

The survey was developed in English by the Working Group, with careful attention to balancing multiple-choice questions—facilitating quantitative data analysis—and open-ended questions, which allowed respondents to share specific insights and contextual nuances. The questions were structured into seven sections:

1. Respondent details
2. Identification and documentation of twentieth-century heritage places
3. Legal protection for twentieth-century heritage places

4. Use of the *Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework*
5. Use of the *Madrid–New Delhi Document*
6. Looking back: Evolution and changes in practice since 2001
7. Looking ahead: Emerging challenges and opportunities

To ensure clarity and reduce the risk of misinterpretation, a glossary was created to define key terms used in the survey. See Appendix II for the text of the English version of the questionnaire and the glossary.

Both the survey and the glossary were provided in English and translated into French, Portuguese, and Spanish. The survey was made available via Google Forms in all four languages, and responses were accepted in any of these languages.

1.3.3 Survey dissemination and implementation timeline

The survey was first announced via email to all ISC20C members. For each country, the Working Group contacted the ISC20C voting or expert members to request their assistance if their National Committee President needed support in completing the survey in May 2024.

The survey was officially sent to the Presidents of all National Committees by the ICOMOS Headquarters via the ADCOM listserv on May 22, 2024. Responses were requested by 30 June 2024. It was recommended that the survey be completed through collaboration between the National Committee and the designated national ISC20C voting or expert member. While the mode of collaboration varied by country, confirmation by the National Committee President that the response submitted represented the National Committee was required. A virtual meeting open to all National Committee Presidents and assisting expert members of the ISC20C was held on May 30, 2024, enabling the Working Group to present the survey and answer any questions that arose.

Working Group members followed up with targeted emails, pairing each identified national ISC20C expert member with their respective National Committee Presidents. Multiple follow-up emails and reminders were sent to specific National Committees throughout the data collection period to encourage participation and completion. The original deadline (June 30, 2024) was later extended to November 9, 2024, to encourage further participation and to allow for clarification of some responses. The last survey submission was received in June 2025.

Each section of the report was analyzed by members of the Working Group, and the synthesis and final editing of the report was undertaken by the project co-leads, Margherita Pedroni and Sheridan Burke.

A total of 63 survey responses were received (see Figure 1.1). Of these, 60 were submitted by ICOMOS National Committees. The remaining three were submitted by expert members: one individual response was provided by the ISC20C voting member from Russia; another came from an expert member in Abu Dhabi, representing only the Emirate and not the UAE National Committee; and a third was submitted by an international ICOMOS member from Algeria, where no National Committee currently existed.



In preparing this report, the editors selected numerous direct quotes from the National Committees' responses for incorporation verbatim. When the text states, for example, "*Chile reported ...*", this refers specifically to the content of the official response submitted by the Chilean National Committee, rather than a general statement attributed to the country as a whole. To ensure transparency and provide a fuller context, the complete set of responses submitted has been compiled and will be available in a separate volume upon request.

1.4 Survey Analysis and Interpretation

Once the survey responses were received, those submitted in French, Portuguese, and Spanish were translated into English by members of the Working Group. The responses were then compiled for analysis. No editing or modifications were made to the original content of the answers. Throughout the report, a few examples and direct quotes from the survey responses are included to illustrate specific points.

To enable comparative descriptions of the findings, it was agreed to use descriptive terms consistently and specifically throughout the report when presenting the statistical analysis. Namely:

- Few = less than 10% of the responses
- Some = between 10 and 30% of the responses
- Many = between 30 and 50% of the responses
- Majority = between 50 and 75% of the responses
- Significant Majority = over 75% of responses

Each section of the report has been edited to open with a brief introduction, present the analyzed data through graphs accompanied by narrative interpretation, and conclude with findings derived from a synthesis of the responses and an informed understanding of the topic.

1.5 Survey Limitations

It is acknowledged that despite the provision of a glossary with the survey, language barriers may have affected the interpretation of specific terms, leading to potential inconsistencies in how questions were understood and answered.

Although National Committees were asked to consult widely with their members, in some cases the responses may reflect the views of individuals, small groups, or subject-matter experts who completed the survey.

Despite multiple efforts to contact all the ICOMOS National Committees, not all responded. While participation in the survey was high in some regions¹⁰—particularly Europe—other regions, such as Africa and the Arab States, are underrepresented due to the smaller number of ICOMOS committees established in those regions, reflecting the broader regional imbalance within ICOMOS (see Table 1.2). Nonetheless, compared to MAP20, this survey received more responses from both Asia and the Pacific and the Arab States, possibly indicating increased engagement in this field in recent years.

¹⁰ The regional organization used in the analysis follows the structure adopted by ICOMOS in the *Rules of Procedure of the International Council on Monuments and Sites* adopted by the Founding General Assembly, and modified by the 21st General Assembly (Sydney, 2023).

This uneven representation limits regional analysis and the drawing of region-specific conclusions.

Number of responses	America	Europe	Asia and the Pacific	Africa	Arab States
From National Committees	11	32	11	2	4
From International ICOMOS members or Individual ISC20C members		1			2

Table 1.2: Number of HPS20 survey responses received per region.

A brief analysis of three regions indicates:

- **a substantial increase in responses to this survey from the Arab States.** The MAP20 survey received no replies from this region by 2005, when there were five National Committees in operation. In 2024, there were 11 National Committees in the region, and the survey received six responses: Jordan, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and two from individuals in the UAE and Algeria, representing a significant change in responsiveness and interest.
- **a substantial decrease in responses from Africa.** The MAP20 survey received four responses, when there were 19 National Committees operational in 2005. In 2024, there were 15 National Committees operational in the region, and two responded to the current survey (South Africa and Nigeria), halving its MAP20 survey response rate.
- **a substantial increase in responses from Asia and the Pacific.** The MAP20 survey received seven responses by 2005 (Australia, India, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, the Philippines and Thailand) when there were 15 National Committees operational in the region. In 2024, 22 National Committees were operational, and this survey received eleven responses (Australia, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Nepal), doubling the survey response rate.

A superficial interpretation suggests increasing interest and activity by National Committees in the Asia Pacific and the Arab States, but declining National Committee activity in Africa, although recent activities such as the MoHoA Modern Heritage of Africa, initiated in 2021, may suggest otherwise. Survey fatigue, inactive National Committees, and lack of subject knowledge may also have contributed.

Fluctuations in the emergence and loss of ICOMOS National Committees, particularly in Africa, have made communications difficult. However, the current Headquarters encouragement of individuals to become international ICOMOS members where a National Committee has not formed offers other avenues for engagement for individual members from all regions with ISC20C.

Further research across all regions and analysis would help prioritize regional focus and priorities.

2. Identification and Documentation of Twentieth-Century Heritage Places

2.1 Introduction

The first section of the survey focused on investigating the activities, practices, and processes of identifying, surveying, and documenting places of potential heritage value. As the first step in the conservation process, it plays a fundamental role in building knowledge, raising public awareness and appreciation, and informing subsequent decisions regarding listing and planning for a site's future. This step is particularly critical for twentieth-century heritage, which is often comparatively understudied, poorly understood, and less appreciated by the general public, and its protection mechanisms are sometimes limited when compared to those for older heritage places.

This section of the survey examined how different countries approach the identification of significant twentieth-century heritage places, focusing on the actors and institutions involved, the methodologies employed, and the availability of specific guidelines or tools to support this work. The survey also gathered references to many studies, surveys, and documentation efforts worldwide, which can serve as examples and case studies of international efforts to identify and document twentieth-century places.

Analysis of the responses to this section of the survey revealed two important observations. First, in most cases, the same institutions and actors are involved in protecting and managing the heritage of all eras, so twentieth-century sites are integrated into broader surveys or inventories without being separately categorized. This sometimes made it challenging to distinguish survey responses that reflect general heritage activities from those intentionally focused on twentieth-century heritage places. Second, some survey responses highlighted variations in the use and interpretation of terms such as “survey” and “inventory” and, in some instances, suggested a conflation of answers between identification and legal protection processes. These discrepancies may stem from linguistic nuances, translation challenges, or fundamental differences in conceptual frameworks between countries.

2.2 Summary of Responses

The first question in this section explored the types of studies and surveys conducted to identify and document potentially significant twentieth-century heritage places (see Figure 2.1). To capture the range of possible approaches, respondents were asked to select, from a list of commonly used research categories, the ones currently in use in their country. These included chronological studies which focus on specific timeframes (such as 1900–1945); thematic approaches which are organized around particular

historic themes; biographical surveys that are centered on the work of prominent designers or architects; typological studies that examine specific building types like domestic architecture or industrial sites; and stylistic approaches which focus on specific architectural styles of the era, such as Modernism or Art Deco. These research study categories reflect the diversity of methodologies commonly used to frame and guide the identification of heritage places generally.

What types of heritage research studies/surveys have been undertaken to identify and document potential Twentieth-century heritage places in your country? Select all that apply




Figure 2.1: Types of research studies or survey categories used to identify and document potential twentieth-century heritage places. As the survey question allowed multiple selections, the total exceeds the number of responses. The number of responses for each option is shown at the end of the bar.

Typological studies (54) emerged as the most cited approach, with *chronological studies* (53) following closely. *Biographical studies* (51) are also widely used, reflecting a common approach to studying modern heritage (and modern architecture in particular) from the angle of its prominent designers. *Stylistic studies* (47) are another commonly used approach for the study and categorization of heritage places. *Thematic studies* (44), though slightly less frequent, suggest a strong interest in exploring the heritage of this period through using broader historical, sociological, or cultural lenses offered through thematic analysis.

Fifteen (15) responses selected *Other* and either reiterated the use of a specific methodology among the options above-mentioned, or they provided examples of particular studies, such as “gender perspective studies, colonial and post-colonial studies” (Israel) or “geographical (e.g., regional, cultural landscapes)” (the Netherlands). Four responses highlighted that research efforts are often sporadic, partial, and lack coordination. For example, Bulgaria stated that research studies and surveys are “sporadic, resulting from academic and NGOs initiatives and not as national heritage policy,” and Canada noted that “there were partial inventories made by various institutions or organizations, but none of them for the whole country or with the same parameters.”

It is worth noting that a significant majority of responses (56) selected more than one study type, indicating that in practice, different survey approaches are often used to identify the complexity and richness of twentieth-century heritage places (see Figure 2.2).




Figure 2.2: Number of research or survey methods used in combination

Beyond traditional methods of identification and documentation, responses also mentioned initiatives in creative and interactive media, including websites, apps, documentaries, TV shows, architectural guides, private artistic collections, and magazines. These practices both support the identification and documentation of significant heritage places and raise public awareness of twentieth-century heritage.

The second survey question identified the government agencies, institutions, and civil society organizations most frequently involved in identifying and documenting twentieth-century heritage (see Figure 2.3). This was a multiple-choice question, and the responses revealed a wide range of actors engaged in this work. Notably, all but two responses selected more than one option in the multiple-answer question, underscoring the collaborative, multi-stakeholder nature of identification and documentation efforts.




Figure 2.3: Types of agencies, institutions, or organizations involved in the identification of twentieth-century heritage. As the question allowed multiple selections, the total exceeds the number of responses. The number of responses for each option is shown at the end of the bar.

Specialist interest groups—such as DOCOMOMO, ICOMOS, National Trusts, NGOs, and community heritage organizations—were the most frequently selected (61), highlighting the prominent role of civil society in driving efforts to recognize twentieth-century heritage. *National governments* followed closely (52), along with *academic institutions* (50), which play a key role in research and advocacy for twentieth-century heritage.

Local governments were also widely mentioned (44), while *state or provincial governments* were slightly less represented (37)—perhaps reflecting the fact that fewer responding countries operate under a federal heritage system. A small number of responses (6) selected *Other*, pointing to additional actors involved in specific national contexts. Among these, four specifically noted the important role played by individual experts and advocates, emphasizing the contributions of practitioners working outside formal institutional structures, and two responses referenced professional groups such as national institutes of architects.

The third question asked respondents to specify the names of the government agencies, institutions, and civil society organizations they had selected in the previous question.

In line with the responses to the previous question, a broad network of actors across different sectors and scales emerged. Government, academia, NGOs, and individuals are involved in the identification and documentation of twentieth-century heritage. The composition and emphasis of involved actors vary by country, shaped by different political systems, government commitment to heritage conservation, the structure of the administration, academic infrastructure, and community and historical conservation traditions.

Some countries reported that their central government does not oversee the identification or listing processes. This frequently resulted in the absence of a single national inventory and the proliferation of multiple state and local lists and surveys, potentially using different selection criteria and survey methodologies. In the absence of a national heritage survey or government-led identification initiatives, the research and documentation of twentieth-century heritage was often carried out by academia, specialist interest groups, professional organizations, and community groups or individuals, often on a voluntary basis. This has led to a body of work that, while rich and extremely important, is often uncoordinated and fragmented, with inconsistent criteria and selection methodologies applied.

A notable and consistent trend was the role of academic institutions in modern heritage research. Universities and research centers—particularly those devoted to architecture, planning, conservation, and heritage studies—are frequently engaged in research and surveys, capacity-building through teaching and doctoral theses, and policy development, often in collaboration with public bodies and NGOs. These academic institutions have become important actors in advancing twentieth-century heritage research by supporting its identification, often through collaborating with government agencies and civil society organizations.

The survey responses also pointed to strong involvement by civil society and professional organizations, including National Committees of international organizations focused on twentieth-century heritage, such as ICOMOS and DOCOMOMO, as well as various local community organizations and National Trusts. These groups contribute to these tasks through technical expertise, public engagement, research, and advocacy. In particular, DOCOMOMO's national chapters play a prominent role in identifying and documenting twentieth-century heritage through initiatives such as the DOCOMOMO Registers, virtual exhibitions, publications, and geographically focused studies.

Professional architects or engineers' bodies—such as associations, institutes, chambers, or unions—were also frequently involved. Responses from Australia, Türkiye, and Portugal mentioned that these organizations have developed dedicated twentieth-century inventories or interactive websites to promote awareness of and engagement with modern heritage.

In addition to these institutional actors, a growing number of grassroots initiatives with a specific focus are emerging. Groups like Art Deco Mumbai in India and Canberra Modern in Australia are leading community-driven efforts to identify and protect twentieth-century heritage, often focusing on specific architectural styles or under-recognized local histories.

Some responses also mentioned initiatives focused on identifying and documenting industrial heritage. The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial

Heritage (TICCIH) was cited as a key actor, offering both thematic leadership and technical expertise in this area. Other responses noted that both public agencies and private providers that manage infrastructure or services (such as water supply in New South Wales, Australia) have created and published dedicated heritage inventories for the assets under their care. In countries where ministries focused on industry exist, such as the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology of the People's Republic of China, industrial heritage is formally recognized through specific mechanisms, such as the 'List of National Industrial Heritage.' In Denmark, a comprehensive inventory dedicated to industrial heritage has been developed to ensure this aspect of the nation's history is acknowledged and leveraged as a valuable resource for the country's ongoing societal development.

The responses also indicated that, in many cases, specialist interest groups initiate or play a significant role in identification and documentation efforts, because twentieth-century heritage often requires specialized knowledge and targeted advocacy. This expertise is not yet widespread among heritage professionals, nor are such practices fully integrated into mainstream heritage frameworks or government agencies.

The next survey question asked whether, in the responding country, there is an inventory of significant twentieth-century heritage places—regardless of whether these sites are officially listed or legally protected (see Figures 2.4 and 2.5). Examples such as DOCOMOMO or UIA inventories were provided to prompt responses.




Figure 2.4: Responses to the question “Does your country have an inventory of significant twentieth-century heritage places?” Response numbers appear inside the pie chart.




Figure 2.5: Map showing which countries have an inventory of significant twentieth-century heritage places.

A significant majority of responses (51) indicated that twentieth-century heritage inventories do exist. Six reported that no inventory is available in their countries; one was unsure; and five selected “Other.” Of these latter responses, four explained that various lists and inventories exist in their countries, but none of them is comprehensive or officially recognized. For example, the response from Poland stated that “there are various lists, there is no one universally recognized,” while the response from the Netherlands noted that “there are numerous inventories.” The response from Sweden explained that “there is a database for all buildings in Sweden, searchable in requested periods of time. There is also a register of listed buildings on the national level and an inventory of buildings in Stockholm.” Although five responses selected “Other,” their answers suggest that inventories (albeit uncoordinated) do exist in their countries. Their interpretation of the question may have led them to select “Other,” even though their responses could reasonably be considered a “Yes.”

It is interesting to note the high level of awareness of twentieth-century heritage inventories—only one response reported being unaware of such an inventory in their country.

Compared with the MAP20 survey and report, these results show a significant positive improvement. The 2005 MAP20 Report (see Appendix I) stated: “It is only a small number of countries in which proactive programs of identification and protection have been initiated.”

Those who answered “Yes” to the inventory question were invited to provide further details and, where possible, references or links to the relevant inventories. The majority of responses (75%) shared links to online inventories dedicated to, or including, twentieth-century heritage. A complete list of these inventories is provided at the end of the report in Appendix IV. Notably, all the identified inventories are publicly accessible; however, the criteria for inclusion are rarely stated.

Often, these inventories encompass heritage places of all ages, evidence that twentieth-century heritage is not treated separately but is instead included within general heritage inventories and as part of the continuum of history. While in some cases these databases allow chronological searches (e.g., Ireland and Sweden), other responses noted that in their countries, it is difficult to isolate modern heritage register entries by chronology for targeted research or policy planning.

The final question in this section of the survey invited respondents to share any additional comments regarding the identification of twentieth-century heritage places (see Figure 2.6). This was an optional, open-ended question that invited further observations beyond the structured survey responses. A total of 41 responses provided additional comments. These responses have been organized by keywords, with each keyword mentioned by at least two countries.

Please use the space below if you want to add other comments about Twentieth-century heritage place identification.




Figure 2.6: Additional comments about the identification of twentieth-century places in each country. The analysis was carried out using keywords. The number of responses for each keyword is shown at the end of the bar.

Nine responses reiterated the important work and *supporting role of universities and scholars* in identifying and documenting twentieth-century heritage. For example, Brazil stated that “there is a significant amount of research done mainly in the Public Universities all over the country.” Costa Rica noted that “the identification of 20th-century cultural heritage sites has been carried out through research and publications

by the academic community, including books, architectural guides, and collections.” Similarly, the responses from the Czech Republic and Algeria stated, respectively, “identification is the subject of research mainly in universities within research projects (NAKI, GAČR) or PhD studies” and “there is no nationally accessible, detailed inventory of all the significant sites of the 20th century, dedicated specifically to heritage dating from this period across the whole of Algeria. However, there are some works produced in academic circles.”

Five responses repeated the *lack of a nationwide inventory* for twentieth-century heritage. For example, Australia stated, “unfortunately none of these inventories is comprehensive; there is no national or statewide perspective on 20th-century heritage. Searching the general heritage databases for modern/20th-century is not always easy.” India noted that “no exclusive inventory of 20th-century heritage buildings/places (such as created by DoCoMoMo in some countries) exists in India either at the national, state, or local level. On the other hand, several city-level initiatives can be seen, e.g., in Chandigarh, New Delhi, Kolkata, Shimla, and Chennai, along with published inventories, indicating rising awareness of the significance of 20th-century heritage.”

Four responses (all from Eastern Europe) raised the issue that *places built after WWII* or in the later part of the century are less appreciated and studied, and are often excluded from existing surveys or inventories. For example, Bulgaria stated, “in Bulgaria, like most European countries, twentieth-century heritage is appreciably divided in pre-war and post-war. While pre-war heritage is slowly but constantly gaining public appreciation, the post-war one is constantly fighting for public recognition for a number of reasons. It is usually perceived as ‘too young,’ too close to us in time, it is still loaded with public emotions (because of the association with the socialist regime) and devoid of objective judgment and measures for preservation. Knowledge and attitudes towards it are still poorly developed or highly polarised among civil and professional communities.” The respondent from Russia stated that “the creation of the Institute of Modernism in Moscow in 2014, bringing together a number of bright researchers and photographers into an expert and advisory group aimed at studying and collecting archival documents of this period, also gives hope for the promotion and protection of the Soviet modernism of the 1960s-mid 1980s. Presently, the number of listed monuments from this period is not sufficient, while the threats of their destruction are increasing. Under the pressure of the stock market, they can face imminent transformation projects and thus the erosion of their authenticity.”

Four responses mentioned the co-existence of *multiple surveys or documentation efforts*, such as the case of Belgium, where “a variety of research studies and surveys have been conducted to identify and document 20th-century heritage, recognizing the architectural, historical, and social value of sites from this period. These studies often

focus on post-war modernist architecture, industrial heritage, social housing projects, and key historical landmarks.”

Three responses noted that existing surveys *focus on individual artists or architects*. For example, in the Philippines, “there are no known official inventories of 20th century heritage. The closest would be the lists of works of architects that the national government has named to the Order of National Artists of the Philippines, for Architecture. There have been five—Juan Nakpil, Pablo Antonio, Leandro Locsin, Jose Zaragoza, and Francisco Mañosa—and their works are identified and are supposed to be protected by law.” In India “the criteria for identification may often be restricted to architectural/artistic distinction, work of a master architect, association with lives of persons of great significance, outstanding examples of a building typology. Little attention is given to other cultural values.”

Three responses highlighted the role of *government-led initiatives* in supporting the identification of twentieth-century heritage. In Denmark, a national strategy is being developed that proposes a “thematic review with nine themes specific to the country.” The strategy aims to capture a broad range of societal and architectural dimensions and to provide a structured framework for identifying and conserving modern heritage across the country. The respondent from Abu Dhabi described a government-led comprehensive initiative, in which “the Department of Culture and Tourism – Abu Dhabi has developed several tools to support the inventory process of the modern heritage of Abu Dhabi Emirate.” This includes “the Collector App to survey sites in the field,” and a process whereby “shortlisted sites are transferred to the IADMH, which serves as the primary repository for research and documentation to assess the values of sites and evaluate whether they meet the criteria for nomination and ultimately registration as modern heritage.” Once a site is registered, “it is placed on the Abu Dhabi Historic Environment Record and will also be placed on the public register platform (which is under development).” The respondent emphasized that “this system is unique to Abu Dhabi Emirate and is fully managed and operated by DCT – Abu Dhabi.” In Spain, surveys on contemporary architecture have been conducted by both public and private entities. The response further explained that “surveys on contemporary architecture have been developed in Spain both by the public sector (Ministry of Culture, Autonomous Communities) and by private associations (DoCoMoMo, Arquia Foundation).” They also noted that a significant effort was made through the “National Plan for the Conservation of 20th-Century Heritage, managed by the Cultural Heritage Institute of Spain.” This national plan has provided critical support for identifying and safeguarding twentieth-century heritage across the country.

Two responses mentioned the *lack of appreciation* for twentieth-century heritage. Bulgaria noted that “generally speaking, though, the whole layer of the twentieth century of Bulgarian architectural and cultural history remains poorly recognized and insufficiently protected as cultural heritage.” Similarly, Chile observed that “there are more institutions and entities that house professionals motivated by this topic.

However, among the general population, these heritage sites are not perceived as relevant or beautiful, except when they hold personal significance.”

On the other hand, two survey responses mentioned *growing interest or high regard* for twentieth-century heritage. For example, Colombia stated: “In Colombia, the legacy of the 20th century and Modern Movement architecture is highly valued. Many buildings and structures from the 20th century are legally protected, either at the national or municipal level. Some have been designated as ‘Assets of Cultural Interest of National Character,’ which is the highest level of protection under Colombian legislation. Additionally, Colombia has registered 20th-century properties on the Tentative List for World Heritage (UNESCO Convention of 1972).” Similarly, North Macedonia observed that “in the last decade, especially after the project called ‘Skopje 2014’ modified many of the architectural works of the previous period, trying to promote historical neo-classic architecture over the creativity of the 20th century, the interest in this architecture among domestic and international professionals, as well as in the general public has increased. A group of architects with their scientific works, researches, promotions and exhibitions, along with several non-governmental initiatives and newly created architectural portals, emerged and encentified the awareness of the significance of this architecture and the necessity of its identification and recognition.”

The Netherlands response described an expansive approach to the identification and documentation of heritage in their country. The response noted that alongside twentieth-century buildings and neighborhoods, “green heritage is sometimes inventoried (parks, cemeteries, sports areas, cultural landscapes) as well as works of applied art (both inside buildings and in public space outdoors).” This broad perspective reflects a growing recognition of diverse heritage types, including not just architectural structures but also cultural and landscape features that shape the legacy of the past century. The Netherlands also acknowledged the emerging challenge of addressing “the youngest built heritage (21C),” remarking that “various 21C buildings are already partly inventoried and selectively listed (e.g. Utrecht).” The Netherlands also noted that “almost all inventories are based on already existing thematic frameworks, but grouped according to geographical and chronological limits. Apart from a few exceptions (WM Dudok, though only in Hilversum), hardly any inventory is made that is entirely based on the oeuvre of one particular architect. Nonetheless, the legacies of significant architects who contributed to the post-war building stock were partially studied as one of the keys for eventual selection for protection in the near future.”

2.3 Key Findings

Overall, the results of this section of the survey indicate a growing recognition of twentieth-century heritage across the responding countries, while also revealing

significant disparities in the scope, coordination, and maturity of identification and documentation practices.

Efforts to identify and document twentieth-century heritage have significantly grown since the MAP20 survey, as evidenced by an expanding body of research and an increasing number of initiatives dedicated to this work. Nearly all countries surveyed have undertaken some activities to identify twentieth-century heritage places, reflecting a rise in awareness of their cultural value and a growing appreciation of their significance.

Despite this improved recognition, the scope, maturity, and coordination of these initiatives vary considerably. In some countries, identification processes are well established and supported by public agencies, whereas in others they remain nascent, fragmented, and largely driven by specialist groups, academic institutions, or individual actors, with limited governmental involvement.

Many responses noted that surveys and inventories of twentieth-century heritage are often incomplete, partial, or conducted on an ad hoc basis. This suggests that although awareness of the value of this heritage is increasing, few countries have yet to develop a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the systematic identification and documentation of this heritage.

As a consequence, many twentieth-century heritage places remain vulnerable. Places that have not been formally identified or listed are often considered and studied only once they face imminent threats of alteration or demolition, rather than being assessed proactively through rigorous research, clearly defined criteria, and inventory methodologies typically associated with government-sponsored surveys. This underscores the continued need for sustained advocacy and vigilance, as well as the development of guidance documents.

In many countries, twentieth-century heritage is included in broader heritage inventories, but it is often difficult to analyze specifically the sites from that era because searches and filters based on period, typology, and thematic criteria are not available. This limitation significantly constrains opportunities for targeted research, comparative analysis, and informed policy development.

A range of methodological approaches is being employed in the identification and documentation of twentieth-century heritage, including typological, chronological, biographical, stylistic, and thematic, often used in combination. Thematic research methods appear to be slightly less commonly used to date. Unlike approaches that focus on specific building types, the work of famous architects, or stylistic movements, thematic research methods seek to identify heritage through broader social, technological, and cultural themes. Comprehensive thematic studies require

engagement and consultation among communities and researchers, raising the understanding and knowledge of the range of heritage resources more broadly.

Despite the potential of thematic analysis to uncover underrepresented or overlooked aspects of twentieth-century heritage, such frameworks are not yet widely in use. ISC20C has played an important role in this area, fostering interest in the thematic analysis of twentieth-century history, particularly through the *Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework*.

The identification and documentation of twentieth-century heritage typically involve a diverse range of stakeholders, including government agencies, academic institutions, specialist organizations such as DOCOMOMO or ICOMOS, and individual experts. Responses pointed out that the identification and documentation of twentieth-century heritage still require specialized knowledge and skills, which are not yet widely available among heritage professionals, responsible institutions and agencies.

Some European responses observed that post-World War II heritage remains less studied, appreciated, and protected than heritage from earlier decades of the twentieth century, owing both to its relative temporal proximity and its complex political and community associations as dissonant heritage. The latter may apply differently in countries or regions where this period coincides with post-independence and nation-building phases, and where the built heritage from this era is associated with aspirations of modernity or post-colonialism. It is also worth noting that there are examples of countries—such as the UK, Italy, France, and Belgium—that have already or are currently examining the post-war period in a structured and comprehensive way to identify heritage places, assess their significance, and promote their protection.

Overall, while numerous valuable initiatives and practices related to the documentation and identification of twentieth-century heritage exist and have been identified through this survey, they are not shared or easily accessible, limiting opportunities for international knowledge exchange, comparative learning, and the broader dissemination of lessons learned.

3. Legal Protection of Twentieth-Century Heritage Places

3.1 Introduction

The second section of the survey focused on the legal protection of twentieth-century heritage sites. The primary objective of legal protection is to conserve heritage places and their significance through governance mechanisms that provide oversight of proposed changes and support conservation actions. Protection may encompass measures to safeguard the physical elements and intangible attributes of heritage places.

A common early protective step is the inclusion of sites in official heritage registers. This listing process is usually associated with the application of controls to prevent inappropriate alterations, losses, or incompatible changes of use to varying degrees, with the aim of ensuring that change and development will support, rather than compromise, the significance of identified sites. Listing may also provide access to incentives to support conservation action.

This survey section explored the legal frameworks and processes established to safeguard twentieth-century heritage places across the responding countries. Recognizing that heritage listing can occur at multiple administrative levels (local, state, regional or provincial, and national), respondents were encouraged to consider these levels simultaneously in their responses. Respondents were also asked to indicate the types of criteria considered in their country's listing procedures.

Respondents were further invited to describe any specific constraints limiting listing of twentieth-century places, as well as the scope of controls and incentives that may be applied to listed places, and to provide examples of practices in listing procedures, relevant references, and general commentary on the practice of protecting twentieth-century heritage places in their country. The full list of references provided is included in Appendices V, VI, and VII.

3.2 Summary of Responses

The first question in this section of the survey sought to estimate the number of twentieth-century heritage places listed in each country (see Figure 3.1). While recognizing that listing can occur at different administrative levels (national, state, and local) and with varying degrees of protection, respondents were invited to consider only the national level for the purposes of this question and to select one of five response options: “<50”, “50-500”, “500-5000”, “>5000”, and “I don’t know.” If the information needed to provide such an estimate was not readily available or if any

difficulties were encountered in producing this estimate, respondents were invited to explain why in a follow-up question.

Please estimate how many Twentieth-century heritage places are listed in your country? Where there are multiple administrative level of protection (National, State, Local), please answer for the national level and add comments on any specific circumstances or limitations to your answer in the comments section below. If the information needed to make such an estimate is not available to you, please select "I don't know" and note the reasons in the next question.




Figure 3.1: Estimate of the number of twentieth-century heritage places listed in the responding countries at the national level. Where exact figures were unavailable, respondents selected "I don't know" and provided explanations in the comments. Response numbers appear inside each pie chart section.

The most common response, selected by 41%, indicated that between 50 and 500 twentieth-century heritage places are listed in their countries; 24% of the responses selected the range of 500-5000; while only 9% indicated that more than 5000 twentieth-century heritage places are listed. In contrast, 6% of responses reported that fewer than 50 twentieth-century heritage places are listed in their countries. Finally, 12 responses (19%) selected "I don't know."

Many responses (51 out of 63) provided additional comments on this question, offering further insights into the estimated number of twentieth-century places listed in their countries; many noted the challenges associated with determining precise figures, and, more generally, about the current state of listing practices for twentieth-century heritage in their countries.

Sixteen responses (Argentina, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, New Zealand, Nigeria, the Philippines, Poland, the Russian Federation, Türkiye, and the United States of America) highlighted substantial difficulties in providing an estimate and noted that the figures provided should be understood as an approximation. Challenges were attributed to the absence of a single

national database, administrative fragmentation, differing legal systems across subnational jurisdictions, or the inability to filter existing databases by period.

Several responses illustrated these issues in practice. Australia noted that “numbers of listed (Protected) C20 places vary significantly across the States and Territories. Each has its own heritage register and criteria. There is no single national list.” Bosnia and Herzegovina explained that “we were not able to determine the exact number, we have estimated it based on partial records.” In Brazil, the lack of a centralized system was emphasized, “considering Brazil has the national policies and municipal legislation in force, there is no consolidated or unified database to account for all protected sites.”

In other countries, challenges stem from limited coverage or uneven levels of documentation.

Israel pointed out that “lists of historic buildings exist in less than half of the municipalities and there is no national database yet, although steps are being taken in that direction.” Nigeria drew attention to discrepancies between formal listings and the awareness of heritage authorities at the local level, stating that “though there are 65 listed sites protected by national legislation, many more are known to local heritage authorities or communities.”

In the Russian Federation, the respondent stressed the breadth of classification, stating that “the number of 20th century monuments in the National Heritage List is around 2,000, but this includes a broad variety of object types.”

Additional responses reinforced these themes. Argentina explained that “since national legislation on heritage protection is fairly recent and recent inventories are not systematized, the number of protected sites from the 20th century is difficult to establish.” In Chile, overlapping legal frameworks were identified as a constraint: “There are two laws that overlap regarding these matters, so different institutions protect 20C heritage depending on the category. There is no single unified record.” In New Zealand, the difficulty lay in the structure of existing registers, as “the exact number of 20th C heritage places is unknown as the main national heritage list is not separated by century, and local authorities maintain their own registers.”

Similarly, the Philippines noted that “there is no definitive list of 20th century heritage in the Philippines, as heritage inventories are done at the local level and are often incomplete or outdated.” In Poland, the absence of period-specific categorization was emphasized, stating that “objects from the 20th century are not separately listed; there are different registers and lists, often maintained at regional levels, with varying coverage.” In Türkiye, decentralization was cited as a key issue: “Giving a precise number is not possible because the system is decentralized. Regional conservation boards keep their own records, and categories vary.”

On the one hand, some countries mentioned an increase or acceleration in twentieth-century heritage listings. In Argentina, “national legislation on heritage protection does not establish time limits, the inclusion of 20th-century properties in national and provincial inventories has increased since the last decades of the 20th century.” Positive developments were also reported in other contexts. Morocco noted that “the pace of registrations has accelerated in recent years, especially in Casablanca, where more than 100 buildings were inscribed on the national heritage list by the Casamemoire association between 1995 and 2016, and more than 200 buildings have just been inscribed on the national heritage list by the Casablanca urban agency, pending the registration of other inventoried buildings.” Similarly, the emirate of Abu Dhabi is actively advancing work in this area, with the respondent stating that “a national list is under development, and protection is primarily managed at the emirate level. Efforts are actively underway to consolidate and document modern heritage more comprehensively.”

Comments also revealed interesting strategies and challenges related to the legal protection of twentieth-century places. Australia, Estonia, and Spain mentioned the use of conservation areas or urban planning tools to safeguard modern heritage. Rather than protecting individual buildings, conservation areas provide broader coverage, including the urban fabric and historical context. Urban planning tools such as zoning regulations, building codes, and design guidelines can provide effective protection and safeguards.

Two responses (Bulgaria and Cyprus) raised a notable bias in heritage recognition, with early-twentieth-century and pre-war buildings receiving more protection than their mid- or late-twentieth-century counterparts. This imbalance, also noted in the previous section of the survey, reflects both political associations, aesthetic preferences, and structural limitations within existing legal heritage frameworks that have age constraints.

Finally, Iran mentioned the proactive role that some municipalities play, noting that “sensitive municipalities unofficially protect people's desire for the protection of 20th CCH [20th century cultural heritage].” Due to their proximity to the communities, these municipalities are often the first to act in safeguarding sites championed by local residents.

The second question in this section focused on the criteria used for assessing heritage places of all periods (i.e., not exclusively twentieth-century heritage places) for listing at the national level (see Figure 3.2). This was a multiple-choice question, and the options provided included commonly used criteria and value categories.

What criteria does your country use to assess and list heritage places? In this question we are not asking specifically about Twentieth-century heritage but the heritage of all ages, at a national level. Select all that apply




Figure 3.2: Criteria used at the national level to assess and list heritage places. Multiple criteria could be selected, reflecting approaches applied to the heritage of all periods. Response numbers appear at the end of the bar chart.

The survey responses show a certain consistency, with *historic values* (60) and *aesthetic/creative/technical achievement* (60) being the most frequently selected criteria, followed by *historical association to people or events* (56), *authenticity* (56), and *integrity* (53). Since all these criteria share a common focus on history, this confirms the significance that legal frameworks place on heritage sites as historical testimony and highlights the attention to the attributes that enable the expression and conveyance of historic values (namely, integrity and authenticity).

Social values (50), *representativeness* (50), *rarity* (49), and *intangible or spiritual values* (43) followed as commonly used criteria, reflecting a trend toward the recognition of social values (including memorial sites). The assessment of rarity and of representativeness is also used to inform comparative significance assessment. Attributes such as first examples and prototypes are sometimes considered decisive qualifiers for listing. The condition of the place, however, is often excluded from significance assessment processes in many national legislative frameworks, as it is a subjective and variable judgement, largely dependent on professional experience and the timing of inspection.

Lastly, *research potential* related to technical or scientific dimensions was the criterion selected by a lesser number of responses (34).

Sixteen responses selected *Other* and shared criteria used in their countries that were not included in the options provided. These included: “Architectural values/fortune” (Belgium, France, Ireland, and the United Kingdom); “Environmental” (Denmark); “Innovation” (Estonia); “Industrial heritage” and “Rescue protection” (France);

“Urbanistic value” (Germany, Jordan, and Abu Dhabi Emirate); “Economic value” (Abu Dhabi Emirate); and “Potential threats” (Portugal).

Lastly, it is noteworthy that there is increasing consideration of specific intangible aspects in applying criteria. For example, in Spain, “the Spanish (national) Historical Heritage Law includes historical, artistic, paleontological, archaeological, ethnological, scientific, technical, documentary, bibliographical and intangible values. The subsequent cultural heritage laws of the Autonomous Communities have added other assessment criteria: architectural, linguistic, urban, industrial, natural, anthropological, cinematographic, social, audiovisual, landscape.”

As part of this question, respondents could provide a link or reference to the national heritage criteria used for listing in their countries. These responses are valuable research resources and are included in Appendix VI.

The third survey question in this section aimed to identify any constraints that might impact or prevent the listing of twentieth-century heritage places (see Figure 3.3). Results are almost even, with 31 responses indicating that there are no constraints preventing the listing of twentieth-century heritage places, while 29 responses selected “yes” and were given the opportunity to indicate the types of obstacles preventing listing in their countries (see Table 3.1).

Are there any legal criteria or regulatory constraints that impact or prevent the listing of Twentieth-century heritage places in your country?




Figure 3.3: Respondents’ views on whether legal criteria or regulatory constraints impact or prevent the listing of twentieth-century heritage places in their country. Response numbers appear inside the pie chart.

<i>If you selected yes, what are they? Select all that apply.</i>	<i>#</i>
a. Official age/time limit (if so, what is the minimum age that a place can be listed)	15
b. Unofficial age/time limit (if so, please describe)	9
c. The demise of the designer/author (the author must not be living)	3
d. Comparative analysis required	8
e. Other, please specify.	1

Table 3.1: Types of legal criteria or regulatory constraints identified by respondents as impacting or preventing the listing of twentieth-century heritage places. Multiple options could be selected.

The age of a site or a specific cut-off date is often the dominant factor that prevents or constrains the listing of heritage places (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Denmark, Greece, Iceland, India, Italy, Lithuania, Moldova, Nepal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and the United Kingdom). This age threshold varies by country, ranging from 30 to 100 years. In other countries, a cut-off date that is typically linked to a historically significant moment in the country's past is used, such as in the case of Saudi Arabia, with a cut-off date of 1932-1975 ("Saudi Arabia as a country was officially declared [in] 1932 and 20th century architecture started to appear after that. According to Saudi Arabia heritage law only architecture 1932-1975 can be classified as 20th century heritage"). Other considerations also influence eligibility for listing, such as in Greece, where "the law says that Neoclassical buildings and earlier are protected."

Nine countries (Canada, Hungary, Iceland, Jordan, Poland, Singapore, Tunisia, Türkiye, and the United States of America) selected "unofficial age/time limit" which for some countries means that the limit is not explicitly set in their legislation but it is nonetheless applied, while other responses use it to state that there is an official age limit but that it can be bypassed if the places hold exceptional significance.

Some responses noted that their national heritage protection frameworks include clauses and provisions that bypass age limitations, thus allowing for the listing of properties considered of exceptional significance (e.g., Denmark, Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, the United States of America, and the United Kingdom) or those facing imminent threats of demolition or alteration (e.g., Tunisia, Türkiye, and the United Kingdom).

Eight countries (France, Hungary, Iran, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, and Türkiye) selected comparative analysis as a condition for listing heritage places. Three (France, Hungary, and Spain) have the author's demise as a condition for listing heritage places. The editors note that in some countries (e.g.,

Australia, Italy and the UK), Moral Rights or copyright legislation provides some guidance on changes affecting the integrity of the works of living architects.

In addition to the options provided, responses noted specific constraints in place in their countries, such as owner consent (Chile, Cyprus, and Japan). For example, Chile explained that the “requirement for a comparative analysis [is] not strictly required, but a report is requested that indicates the values, whether there is community support, and whether the owner agrees or not.” Similarly, Cyprus stated that “owner’s consent [is] required, which affects all heritage places, including Twentieth-century heritage.” Japan stated that “customs exist, such as the consent of the owner and, in principle, a minimum age of 50 years.”

Finland pointed to the difficulties in protecting interiors with the current legislative framework: “Interiors and especially loose furniture has turned out difficult to protect, even if the law should allow, it is not used. As the owner of the site, Aalto Foundation has proposed protection of some loose furniture in Aalto Studio in the protection process, which is currently going on.”

Canada mentioned that “in some cases, legislation or regulations set an official time/age limit for modern buildings to be considered for listing or for eligibility in funding programs. For example, in Quebec, religious buildings built after 1975 are not eligible for funding for restoration, and only buildings built before 1940 are mandatory to be part of municipal inventories.”

The respondent from the Russian Federation elaborated that “officially, there are not any regulatory constraints preventing the listing of the 20th century properties except for the time limit for listing, which is equal to 40 years within the National heritage legislation. According to the Federal Law, ‘the revealed/identified objects of cultural heritage could be listed in forty years after the moment of their creation (with exclusion of the memorial apartments and memorial houses, which have been associated with the life and activities of the outstanding personalities who have special merits to Russia, and which can be classified as objects of cultural heritage before the expiration of the specified period after the death of such persons)’ (Art. 18, § 12).”

Finally, Türkiye noted that “although the law and the legislation supporting it provide legal protection through designation, this is not a guaranteed situation. The losses accelerating since the turn of the last century appear to have a direct relationship with the global neoliberal tendencies and top-down decision-making processes. The status of designation may easily be cancelled due to economic and/or political reasons, resulting especially in the destruction of the 20C heritage buildings and sites.”

The fourth question in this section aimed to identify the five youngest twentieth-century heritage places listed in each country (see Figure 3.4). Respondents were invited to specify information regarding the date of listing, the ‘age’ of the place at the

time of listing, as well as information regarding their location and date of construction, if readily available. It was intended that this might be an interesting comparison to the MAP20 survey, where the same question was asked, and a list of more than 600 sites was assembled.

In 12 cases, respondents were unfortunately unable to locate this information, underscoring once again the importance of effective inventorying and data interrogation mechanisms. For the remaining 51 responses, a wealth of listed heritage places from the recent past was identified. Responses mentioned sites that are protected at either the national or lower administrative levels. For reporting consistency, responses were considered only when they indicated the five youngest heritage places listed at the national level. The list of places is provided in Appendix VIII.

How old were the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places when they have been listed in your country?




Figure 3.4: Analysis of the data provided by responses distributing the youngest twentieth-century heritage places listed in the responding countries by decade. Response numbers appear at the end of the bars.

The majority of the youngest listed sites date from the second half of the century, with peaks in the 1960s and 1980s. A significant majority of the heritage places that the responses identified are architecturally important places, associated with prominent designers (e.g., Leandro Locsin, Antonio Miró, Alvar Aalto, Carlos Raúl Villanueva, Eduardo Souto de Moura, Philip Johnson, etc.), places listed with specific intangible associations such as monuments and sites of memory (e.g., cemeteries, memorial parks, and landscaped areas), industrial heritage (e.g., railway stations, bridges, storage facilities, etc.) as well as educational and civic facilities (e.g., libraries, cultural centers, etc.). Overall, the buildings and sites identified encompass a wide range of

typologies and uses, from prominent public facilities to places of worship and private residential properties.

The fifth question in this section of the survey asked respondents to identify who can propose heritage places for listing (see Table 3.2).

<i>Who can propose twentieth-century heritage places for listing in your country? Select all that apply.</i>	<i>#</i>
No limits - anyone can propose a place for listing	42
Government agencies	15
Owners	10
Specialist organizations (ICOMOS, DOCOMOMO, etc.)	10
Civil society organizations	7
Others, please specify.	6

Table 3.2: Entities identified by respondents as eligible to propose twentieth-century heritage places for listing in their country. Multiple options could be selected.

The majority of responses (42) indicated that anyone can propose a place for listing. Other responses indicated government agencies (15), owners (10), specialist organizations (10), and civil society organizations (7).

Several responses noted that whilst many actors can initiate a listing proposal, government action is ultimately required for listing protection.

Some responses also noted that in federal nations like Germany, protection mechanisms and who can propose places for listing differ across federal states and can include government agencies, owners, and NGOs.

The sixth question in this section asked whether the heritage inventory dedicated to, or that includes, twentieth-century heritage places in each country is publicly available (see Table 3.3).

<i>Is the heritage inventory dedicated to or that includes the listed twentieth-century heritage places in your country publicly available?</i>	#
Yes	49
No, access to the inventory is restricted	8
Not applicable, there is no heritage inventory that includes twentieth-century heritage places	5
I don't know	1

Table 3.3: Respondents' indications of whether the heritage inventory that includes listed twentieth-century heritage places in their country is publicly accessible.

Notably, a significant majority of responses (49) indicated that heritage inventories are publicly available. This accessibility not only enables citizens to consult what is listed, thereby improving awareness and supporting the dissemination of knowledge, but also clearly signals which heritage listing restrictions may apply to certain sites. Additionally, it enables international exchange and comparisons for professionals and researchers.

Particularly noteworthy are efforts to develop user-friendly, online, georeferenced, information-based platforms for publicly displaying protection mechanisms and their boundaries (e.g., in Portugal and Slovenia).

Only a few responses indicated a restricted access level (8). In some cases, such as in Norway, there are specific platforms that are limited to accredited professionals. In others, such as Hungary, access is differentiated, with some databases requiring credentials and others being freely accessible to the general public.

The seventh question identified the level of administration at which the listing of twentieth-century heritage places occurs (see Table 3.4). The data is fragmented, as different countries use different names for state and regional levels of listing, and in others, recommendations may be made locally or regionally, but listing decisions are taken at the national level.

<i>At what level of administration does the listing of twentieth-century heritage places happen in your country? Select all that apply.</i>	<i>#</i>
Federal/National	48
State	34
Local	46
Other	3

Table 3.4: Administrative levels at which the listing of twentieth-century heritage places occurs. Multiple levels could be selected.

The figures indicated that listings occur at the *federal/national* (48), *state* (34), and *local* (46) levels, indicating a distribution of responsibilities across multiple levels of administration.

The eighth question examined the type of protection and the incentives that listing of heritage places provides, using a multiple-choice format (see Table 3.5).

<i>What kind of protection and incentives does the listing of heritage places provide? Select all that apply.</i>	<i>#</i>
Control of demolition	62
Control of alterations/change of use	60
Control of development nearby	47
Financial support for conservation work (grants, incentives)	41
Other, please specify	14

Table 3.5: Types of protection measures and incentives provided through the listing of heritage places. Multiple options could be selected.

Control of demolition (62) and *control of alterations/change of use* (60) were the most frequently selected forms of protection, applicable to nearly all the responses. *Control of development nearby* (47) was also chosen by a significant number of responses, indicating that attention to issues such as development in the surrounding environment, impacts on the setting, and the visual impact on historic views is a consideration for listed places in many countries. Similarly, *financial support for conservation work* (41) reflects efforts by many governments to balance regulatory restrictions with financial incentives for conservation.

The responses that selected *Other* provided valuable insights into the relationship between listing practices and the reality of implementing protection measures. China described State-led financial support for conservation planning, guidance, and research for listed sites. Costa Rica, while offering limited aid, integrated incentives

into local regulatory plans. Singapore has developed innovative site-specific planning policies, exemplified by the conservation of the Golden Mile Complex, aligning planning incentives with heritage conservation objectives.

In the Netherlands, authorities provided advisory services that contribute knowledge and technical support. In several countries, the legal protection that comes from listing also translated into direct access to, or the requirement for engaging, specialized professional services for the care of heritage places. France and Denmark, for example, emphasized the role of expert oversight and technical competence in conservation efforts. In France, qualified practitioners—such as *Architectes en Chef des Monuments Historiques* and *Architectes du Patrimoine*—oversee conservation projects, depending on the ownership status. Denmark, similarly, requires specific conservation practices for buildings and landscapes, reflecting a methodical, technically grounded approach to heritage care.

The Canadian response indicated that each province has its own legislation, meaning that the impact of heritage listing varies across jurisdictions. In contrast, France applies a more centralized system, with clear requirements for authorization of alterations and a strong emphasis on maintaining the external appearance of protected buildings.

However, the mere existence of legal frameworks does not guarantee effectiveness. In the Czech Republic, for instance, legal provisions officially offer wide-ranging protection, yet implementation remains weak—particularly for twentieth-century places. Similarly, Bulgaria reported issues with enforcing conservation laws, reducing their effectiveness.

Some responses highlighted the use of financial incentives for listed places to encourage conservation. In Australia, for example, certain cities or states provide modest grants to support conservation works, transfer of development rights policies, and local tax/council rates relief. Cyprus similarly offers tax incentives and mechanisms such as the transfer of development rights, enabling owners to recover economic value potentially lost due to conservation constraints.

Jordan noted that “financial support is already mentioned in the law but not practiced yet,” while Thailand reported that “mostly public buildings are listed for National Monument. There are no incentive[s] or budget to help conserving monuments that [are] own[ed] by [the] private sector,” illustrating how legal provisions often fail in practical implementation due to insufficient funding or political will.

Overall, the breadth of examples provided by the responses regarding protection mechanisms applicable to twentieth-century heritage places, while highlighting persistent challenges, also points to a range of frameworks, policies, and strategies leading to positive outcomes.

The ninth question in this section asked respondents to provide links or references to key information and documents concerning national legal protection frameworks. Full responses are reported in Appendix VII.

The tenth and eleventh questions addressed World Heritage inscriptions and tentative listings of twentieth-century heritage places. A total of 33 responses indicated that their country has twentieth-century places inscribed, while 23 responses reported modern places included on the tentative list. Although approximate, these figures represent a significant increase over the past two decades, during which ISC20C, among others, has been particularly active in World Heritage advisory work and promoting awareness of its significance.

The final question in this section invited respondents to share additional reflections on the legal protection of twentieth-century heritage in their countries. This optional open-ended question elicited comments on recurring challenges, potential solutions, and broader insights.

Eleven responses indicated that existing legal frameworks do not provide adequate or effective protection for twentieth-century heritage, often due to weak incentives or poor enforcement, though some responses also shared positive examples. For example, Australia observed that “listing does not always protect places effectively, a wider range of mechanisms to support conservation is needed, especially regarding sustainable development and embodied energy conservation.” Costa Rica similarly highlighted a lack of political will, stating that “there has been a lack of political will to protect sites and buildings constructed in the second half of the 20th century”, a situation also noted by Türkiye since the turn of the century.

France identified issues of scale and methodology: “Protection is insufficient...to highlight the heritage interest of a group of buildings that is too large to be protected using current methods.” India illustrated the challenges of applying laws designed for ancient monuments to modern heritage, explaining: “Since India has no national, state or local level laws for 20C heritage, the age limit for identification & protection may vary...However, most of these are still to be documented/recorded either as their significance is not well-understood or, due to a lack of resources or, the application of legal provisions originally crafted for ‘Ancient Monuments and Sites’. There is an urgent need to sensitise heritage owners so as to redress the situation.”

Greece presented an even more adverse situation, reiterating that no legal protection exists for twentieth-century sites in the country.

A related concern is the under-representation of certain decades, building typologies, or themes of twentieth-century heritage in official heritage inventories. For example, Bulgaria reported that “twentieth-century heritage is under-represented in [the] Bulgarian National Heritage Register, especially post-war examples.” Without formal

listing, such sites receive little attention or support; this is especially true for socialist and dissonant heritage, which are notable absences in the heritage register.

By contrast, a small number of countries are actively strengthening support for twentieth-century heritage at the national level. For example, in China, government commitment is being matched with financial resources: “The National Cultural Heritage Administration...has strongly supported the protection of the cultural heritage of the twentieth century, providing tens of millions of yuan in financial support.”

In countries with federal systems or multiple layers of governance, legal fragmentation often results in uneven or patchy protection. For example, the Canadian response emphasized this challenge: “The legal context presents a wide variety of situations depending on the provinces.” In other cases, the problem is not the absence of legislation but the lack of enforcement or institutional follow-through, sometimes due to resource availability or political will. In the Philippines, “the legal protection...seems adequate on paper but lamentably weak in execution.” Venezuela echoed this comment, noting that “the Law...was one of the most innovative” but “the development of local regulations and management procedures did not progress as easily.”

Finally, cultural perceptions strongly influence whether twentieth-century heritage is protected. Chile noted that “society generally has difficulty attributing value to these sites, except when the historical or memory component is highly significant.” In Iran, the issue is more institutional: “Apart from the academic society, there is not enough understanding of 20th CCH [20th century cultural heritage] yet.” In Lithuania, historical associations exacerbate the problem: “Negative association with the Soviet period...leads to poor-quality renewal projects.”

3.3 Key Findings

The legal protection of twentieth-century heritage is shaped by multiple interrelated factors, including existing legal frameworks and conservation practices, cultural perceptions, stakeholder engagement, available resources, political will, and the impact of historical trajectories on how each country deals with its own recent past.

The abundance of places and the relatively recent nature of twentieth-century heritage emerged as key factors influencing listing processes and statutory protection. Overall, age-based thresholds appear to be a constraint in about one-third of the responses. These thresholds vary significantly between countries, reflecting broader differences in how this built heritage is understood and valued. In some countries, a 100-year limit applies, in others, a 30-year limit is used, while some jurisdictions impose a specific cut-off date. In some cases, legislation allows exceptions for sites deemed to possess extraordinary significance, enabling listing and legal protection, even when age-based thresholds are not met.

Compared to the MAP20 survey findings (Appendix I), which observed that statutory listing programs for twentieth-century heritage were still in the formative stages, the responses to this survey, conducted nearly 25 years later, indicate that many countries have since formalized their protection mechanisms and have expanded them to include twentieth-century heritage places. Greater historical distance has also contributed to broader recognition, reduced controversy, and increased acceptance of the value of this heritage. Additionally, the passage of time has simply rendered earlier parts of the century eligible for protection under age-based criteria; for example, the first quarter of the twentieth century now meets the 100-year threshold in some jurisdictions, while the 1990s are becoming eligible under 30-year rules.

Despite this progress, fragmented and disaggregated regulatory frameworks and administrations often make it difficult to accurately quantify the number of twentieth-century heritage places listed in official heritage registries. Few heritage databases are integrated across administrative levels, and their design does not readily facilitate the extraction of time-specific data. While this issue is not unique to twentieth-century heritage, it is particularly evident in this context.

The survey responses revealed a clear need to identify and share good practices in register development, as well as to disseminate inventory and database tools that can be used—and potentially integrated—across different levels of governance to ensure nationwide coverage and analysis of heritage data.

In the majority of countries, anyone can propose sites for listing, and then national and local administrations are the authorities responsible for the decisions. The responses highlighted the important informal roles played by various stakeholders, including specialized civil society groups and the public, in supporting listing processes of twentieth-century sites. The international documentation work of DOCOMOMO has been particularly significant in providing foundational information for listing. The advocacy for threatened sites undertaken by ICOMOS ISC20C through its Heritage Alerts program is also notable. Other organizations, such as the Twentieth Century Society in Britain, combine advocacy with an official statutory role in managing change to listed buildings.

Responses emphasized that listing alone does not always ensure effective protection, either because the legal constraints are not strict enough, or are not effectively enforced, often due to a lack of political will. The specific challenges of twentieth-century built heritage—such as quantity, scale, and lack of appreciation—reveal that a broader range of planning and financial mechanisms is required to ensure that listing actually leads to long-term conservation outcomes.

Responses suggested that effective mechanisms that directly align heritage conservation with sustainable development initiatives and embodied energy programs may offer significant opportunities. Further research and collaboration are needed to

strengthen and demonstrate the linkages between heritage conservation, sustainable development programs, and the rapidly evolving field of embodied energy management, which currently present both opportunities and risks for twentieth-century heritage through potential maladaptation.

Some responses noted that society at large often struggles to appreciate and attribute value to twentieth-century sites, unless their historical or commemorative significance is particularly strong. This tendency is reflected in the increasing use of intangible heritage values as assessment criteria and in the increasing number of memorial sites—which include the youngest heritage places—being listed or evaluated. At the same time, there is a clear need to promote a broader understanding of the full range of heritage values that warrant protection.

Public awareness campaigns were recognized as essential to making this heritage better understood, more relatable, and more widely appreciated, thereby strengthening support for its conservation. Interpreting and presenting site significance effectively at a time when statutory protection may be becoming less effective is key to increasing understanding and appreciation. Responses cited several successful case studies, often developed in collaboration with civil society organizations.

These observations underscore the ongoing need for advocacy on behalf of twentieth-century places that come under threat, regardless of whether they have already been recognized as significant. While the Heritage Alerts initiative developed by ISC20C in collaboration with DOCOMOMO and UIA has become a valuable campaigning tool, it is inherently reactive and resource-intensive. Such campaigns often come too late and cannot substitute for proactive, integrated, and strategic planning for heritage, coupled with robust legal protection frameworks.

Finally, rapid political change experienced in many regions during the twentieth century—such as shifts within the Soviet bloc and the independence from colonial powers of many countries in Africa and Asia—has had significant impacts on the ways and means by which twentieth-century heritage places have been perceived, appreciated, protected, and managed. The protection of socialist and dissonant heritage is a topical discourse in which the ISC20C has initiated engagement through its Triennial Action Plan 2024-26. However, the limited references to these themes in survey responses may suggest they are not yet well known and would benefit from greater visibility and promotion by ISC20C.

4. Use of the Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework

4.1 Introduction

The *Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework* (TCHTF) was developed in response to the needs identified in the MAP20 survey and to the thematic inventory approaches emerging at the time. This ambitious initiative set out to identify the major historic themes that characterized the twentieth century globally, and to illustrate them through examples of buildings, structures, and landscapes that were created in response.

The TCHTF was published in 2021 as the *Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework: A Tool for Assessing Heritage Places* as a joint initiative of ISC20C and the Getty Conservation Institute. Its primary objective is to support the identification, assessment, and comparison of significant places that shaped the twentieth century worldwide. Rather than focusing on chronology, architectural style, or associations with notable individuals/events, the TCHTF promotes an analysis grounded in historical context and relationships, organizing research and survey activities around the key themes. While developed to enable global comparisons, the TCHTF can also be readily adapted at national or local levels to respond to the diversity of regional experiences and historical trajectories.

This section of the survey sought to gain a clearer understanding of how National Committees have engaged with the TCHTF since its publication, if the themes included are considered relevant in the responding countries, and how ISC20C can better promote its use.

4.2 Summary of Responses

The first question in this section asked respondents whether the TCHTF has been used in their respective countries (see Figure 4.1). Those who indicated that it had been used were invited to comment on its usefulness and to provide links or references to case studies.




Figure 4.1: Respondents' indications of whether the TCHTF has been used in their country. The numbers in each sector indicate the number of responses.

A total of 34 responses (54%) reported that the TCHTF has not yet been used in their respective countries, while 17 responses (27%) stated that the TCHTF has been used, and seven (11%) stated that they were unaware of whether the TCHTF had been employed. The remaining five responses (8%) selected "Other" and provided further explanation.

Countries reporting active use of the TCHTF described a wide range of applications, consistent with its authors' intentions. These include its use to: inform academic research (Chile, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, India, Jordan, and Lithuania); as a pedagogical tool (Chile, Costa Rica, Estonia, Lithuania, Slovenia, and Türkiye); in government-led studies (Singapore and the United States of America); in the preparation of UNESCO World Heritage nomination dossiers (Finland and Portugal); for inventory development (Chile); and in planning thematic conferences related to twentieth-century heritage (Israel).

Responses offered several illustrative comments. For example, Costa Rica noted that "it has been precious for research and academic purposes." Finland reported that "the framework has been utilized in the preparing work of Aalto architecture for the UNESCO World Heritage." Singapore explained that there had been a "heritage research study on Singapore built heritage commissioned by Singapore government. Relevant subthemes from TCHTF were used to support the value-based assessment of 20C heritage places in Singapore." The United States of America reported that the "USA uses a thematic approach to survey and listing works and commissions context statements which equate to thematic studies, so there is potential to encourage the use of TCHTF themes for context statement studies," and "it is currently being trialed by the State Historic Office of Preservation in California to prepare a statewide thematic study of the twentieth-century."

In addition to documenting recent uses of the framework, responses also reflected on challenges and opportunities related to its application. Germany highlighted the absence of a procedure to integrate the framework into heritage identification processes, noting that while “it is useful as a kind of implicit knowledge of the themes relevant for identifying the heritage of the 20th century, yet, there is no formalised procedure to implement the framework in identification processes.” Türkiye stated that “its adaptability is being studied in academic circles.”

India’s response indicated that awareness of the TCHTF is not widespread yet, although its 20C National Scientific Committee has used the framework to conduct research at the local level (city level): “ICOMOS India, through its NSC20C, has conducted a research project using the Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework at a city-level (in Kolkata), and, the same exercise was undertaken for Mumbai a few years ago. However, in general, heritage practitioners and academia are not aware of its content or applicability.”

Among the responses selecting “Other” as their response, Australia, the Netherlands, and the United States of America noted that thematic approaches have been used in their countries, but they predate the publication of the TCHTF. The Netherlands and the Abu Dhabi Emirate indicated that the TCHTF has seen limited use because inventory and listing activities related to twentieth-century heritage were already well underway before its publication, and they used other approaches or different themes.

At the same time, Australia emphasized that the TCHTF was seen as a useful tool that helps identify gaps in safeguarding twentieth-century heritage, but needed more promotion: “The Framework is a useful document but not widely known; two recent court cases in Qld [Queensland] have highlighted this as a gap, and the Queensland State Heritage branch is currently commissioning a study based on the ISC20C Twentieth Century Thematic Framework.”

Finally, Denmark reported that while the TCHTF has not been formally adopted as a tool in their country, a draft version informed the development of the national listing strategy based on a thematic approach: “The framework has not yet been officially used in Denmark, but in practice, it is known and taken into consideration by *By og Land Danmark* (heritage NGO with an expert subcommittee on mid- and late 20th-century heritage) when assessing heritage from after 1940. The 20th Century Historic Thematic Framework-draft has also been used as inspiration for the new Danish listing strategy, published 2022.”

The second question in this section asked whether respondents considered the ten global historic themes identified in the TCHTF to be useful and relevant for survey and identification work in their countries (see Figure 4.2). Respondents who answered affirmatively were subsequently asked to select all the themes that were most relevant

to their respective countries. Those who selected “Other” were invited to provide an open-ended response.

Are the ten global historic themes identified in the Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework useful and relevant for survey and identification in your country?




Figure 4.2: Respondents' views on the usefulness and relevance of the ten global historic themes from the TCHTF. Response numbers are indicated in each section of the pie chart.

A significant majority of the responses (73%) indicated that the themes outlined in the TCHTF are useful and relevant. A smaller group (11%) selected “I don’t know,” while a few responses (10%) stated that they did not consider the themes useful or relevant for identifying twentieth-century heritage in their country. The remaining responses (6%) selected “Other” and provided additional explanation. For example, Poland commented that “research on the heritage of the 20th century is advanced, but very dispersed. Adopting common guidelines is practical, but unlikely to be implemented when there are a large number of research centers and researchers.” Hungary noted that “there is no information on applying these recommendations.”

Responses that indicated that the themes were useful and relevant were then asked to identify which themes were most applicable to their country (see Figure 4.3). The themes most frequently selected were Theme 7 (*Conserving the Natural Environment, Buildings, and Landscapes*), Theme 1 (*Rapid Urbanization and the Growth of Large Cities*), Theme 9 (*Religious, Educational, and Cultural Institutions*), Theme 8 (*Popular Culture and Tourism*), and Theme 5 (*Transportation Systems and Mass Communications*).

By contrast, the least frequently selected themes were Theme 3 (*Mechanized and Industrialized Agriculture*), Theme 4 (*World Trade and Global Corporations*), and Theme 10 (*War and Its Aftermath*).

If you selected yes, which themes/ subthemes are most relevant/useful to your country? Select all that apply




Figure 4.3: Respondents' rating of the relevance of the TCHTF themes in their country. Multiple options could be selected. Response numbers are indicated at the end of each bar.

The third question in this section of the survey asked respondents whether they perceived any themes or subthemes to be missing, not relevant, or different in their country (see Figure 4.4). Where respondents considered that themes specific to their country were overlooked, they were invited to elaborate through an open-ended response.

Thirty-eight responses (60%) noted that no themes or subthemes were missing, irrelevant, or different in their country. However, 25 response (40%) highlighted areas of perceived limitations or gaps in the TCHTF.

Four National Committees (Denmark, India, Estonia, and Germany) indicated that certain country-specific themes were not adequately represented. These include the democratic welfare state, landscape architecture/open spaces, the partition of the Indian subcontinent, and dissonant and contested heritage associated with periods such as Nazi Germany and the Socialist GDR. While responses acknowledged that aspects of these issues may already be included or indirectly alluded to within existing framework themes, they argued that these themes or typologies warrant more explicit recognition to ensure meaningful inclusion.

Denmark, for instance, noted that “the theme of the democratic welfare state can be difficult to express through the themes of the framework. This also applies to the green cultural heritage of the 20th century which is difficult to inscribe (park systems, designed urban spaces, allotment gardens, sports fields, pedestrian paths, green

hedges and much more—all the intentionally planned publicly accessible green spaces that were a core ambition of the welfare state's planning system and a hallmark of the built environment 20thC Danish society). Moreover, landscape/open spaces are an integral part of 20th-century architectural heritage, which the assessment frameworks reflect to only a limited degree.”

Three National Committees highlighted the need for a more explicit consideration of architecture as a product of modernity. Canada identified “modern architecture as an expression of modernity” as a missing theme. Similarly, the Czech Republic highlighted the absence of themes addressing the evolving social and professional contexts shaping production during the twentieth century, while Hungary emphasized the importance of recognizing individual architectural authorship and the intellectual dimensions of architectural design.

Several responses proposed additional themes that they considered particularly relevant within their national contexts. These included, for example, de-population and rural settlements (Ireland), vernacular traditions (Jordan), private housing (Portugal), and energy infrastructures, urban landscapes, and public space (Spain). Others articulated their suggestions in more explicit thematic terms. One response highlighted the relevance of “gender, vernacular architecture, military/defense architecture (not war)” (Israel). Another pointed to specific sub-themes within existing categories, identifying “Theme 5, one sub-theme: the heritage of aerospace conquest (priority of CSI AeroSpace Heritage)” and “Theme 3, one sub-theme: Mechanical and Industrial Agriculture” (France).

Other responses emphasized themes linked to contested histories, identity, and social processes. One response noted that “First Nations contact sites, many with continuous occupation and dissonant values require further thought. We note the differences over time in colonial and post-colonial periods result in distinctly different places” (Australia). Another emphasized “migration (inside the country and abroad), slavery, indigenous peoples, places of memories of the dictatorship” as key thematic areas requiring greater recognition (Brazil). Similarly, one response stressed the importance of addressing “architectural heritage linked to totalitarian regimes, architectural heritage in colonial territories” (Italy).

Natural disasters and post-disaster reconstruction also emerged as a significant theme. North Macedonia proposed “natural disasters (similar to theme 10) with a subtheme: Rebuilding and reconstruction,” encompassing a wide range of place types, including “new urban city plans; conservation and reconstruction of damaged cultural heritage; public spaces and monuments of remembrance of the catastrophes; new housing estates, social housing, educational and other types of public, administrative, transportation, and other types of buildings and facilities.” This theme was illustrated with a national example, noting that “a devastating earthquake in 1963 left Skopje (the capital of North Macedonia) in ruins, after which a huge restoration and reconstruction

of the city took place, creating a combination of modernist and brutalist buildings of various purposes, many of which become icons of that period.”

Finally, some countries (Nepal, Norway, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom) did not provide a definitive answer to the question but offered relevant observations. Nepal noted a structural misalignment between the thematic approach outlined in the TCHTF and its national inventory system, which is organized chronologically or by function. Norway strongly endorsed the conceptual value of the TCHTF, viewing it as a tool that supports contextualization of individual sites within broader national development trends and thus enhances prospects for long-term management. “The value of TCHTF is that it encourages thematic thinking which sets individual buildings/sites in context of national development trends. Setting heritage properties in context by theme and trend should secure more support and attention for them increasing the likelihood of better long-term management. So it is more important to realise the potential of a thematic approach than to add additional categories. By example Theme 6 [Internationalization, New Nation-States, and Human Rights] is very relevant for considering Norway in the 20th Century.” The Netherlands noted that the “TCHTF was published long after all kinds of inventory and listing activities for 20C heritage had already begun in our country and are further developed,” adding that guidance on using the TCHTF and on relating its application to the assessment of cultural-historical significance at different scales was lacking. The United Kingdom acknowledged that while its own thematic systems are well developed, the TCHTF is regarded as a valuable intellectual stimulus that encourages broader, more inclusive thinking when adapted to local contexts.

The final question in this section of the survey invited respondents to share suggestions on how ISC20C could more effectively disseminate, facilitate, and promote the use of the TCHTF within their respective countries.

Analysis indicates that most responses (25) recommended workshops, training, and capacity-building initiatives as the primary means to support the use and understanding of the TCHTF in their countries. This was followed by collaborations with government bodies, heritage agencies, and policymakers to apply the TCHTF (13 responses), and by institutional collaborations that fostered partnerships among heritage institutions, professional associations, and ICOMOS National Committees (12 responses). Other responses (11) believed there is a need for building technical expertise in using a thematic approach, especially among conservation professionals, heritage agencies, and academic institutions.

Ten responses mentioned opportunities to use the TCHTF in universities and disseminate it to students.

Some responses also highlighted the need for a coordinated communication and outreach strategy, while others emphasized the value of translating the document into

other working languages to facilitate a broad reach across different National Committees. They also acknowledged the need to adapt the TCHTF to local contexts, supplementing global themes with regionally or nationally specific examples.

One response highlighted activities already undertaken to actively promote the thematic framework, including organizing a virtual regional workshop in the Middle East and developing an Arabic adaptation of the TCHTF to support its dissemination and encourage wider application in the Arab States.

4.3 Key Findings

The responses revealed that the TCHTF is widely regarded as a useful tool, but it has not yet been widely promoted or applied in practice. While 73% of responses found the themes proposed in the TCHTF to be relevant, 54% also reported that it has not been used in their countries. This disparity suggests that, although the TCHTF has the potential to be applied, its practical uptake remains limited.

The majority of responses acknowledged the value of the TCHTF and of the thematic approach proposed for understanding the diversity of twentieth-century heritage, while some felt that important dimensions of national or regional histories are not adequately described. Many of these are already included or alluded to in the current framework, but some responses called for clearer recognition of such aspects. Other responses emphasized the need to explicitly consider twentieth-century architecture as a product of modernity, including its intellectual and design dimensions.

Responses also revealed some confusion between historic themes and the criteria used for listings. In several cases, historic themes were conflated with building typologies, suggesting a need for clearer explanation of these as distinct but complementary concepts—one concerned with types of places, the other with situating places within broader historical processes and narratives.

The survey responses also highlighted a pressing need for additional guidance on using the TCHTF and adopting a thematic approach so that it can serve as an effective tool for identifying, assessing, and ultimately protecting twentieth-century heritage.

Challenges related to its dissemination were also frequently noted. Several responses pointed to the need for more active promotion of the TCHTF to increase awareness among professionals, government agencies, and national heritage institutions. Addressing this gap was identified as an essential next step to expanding its use. Targeted efforts to promote the TCHTF at the national level through capacity-building initiatives, translations, tailored communication strategies, and securing funding to support its application would significantly improve its visibility and facilitate its use and impact.

Collaborations between ISC20C and ICOMOS National Committees could play a critical role in facilitating region-specific adaptation, disseminating the TCHTF, and encouraging its integration into existing heritage practices and planning processes. National Committees and other stakeholders can become active agents in interpreting and adapting the framework through research, participatory workshops, and conferences, utilizing the efficiency and accessibility of digital platforms.

5. Use of the Madrid–New Delhi Document

5.1 Introduction

In 2010, in response to requests for practical doctrinal guidance and shared principles, ISC20C initiated a broad discussion on approaches to the conservation of twentieth-century heritage places. This process was launched at a major conference in Madrid, marking the beginning of drafting *Approaches to the Conservation of Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage*, colloquially known as the Madrid Document. Subsequently, the document was revised, and its focus expanded beyond architectural heritage through collaboration with several ICOMOS International Scientific Committees. The expanded and revised text was retitled and endorsed for dissemination and promotion by the ICOMOS General Assembly in Delhi in 2017 as *Approaches to the Conservation of Twentieth-Century Cultural Heritage*, also colloquially known as the Madrid–New Delhi Document (MNDD).

This section of the survey examined whether and in what ways the MNDD is being used in different countries and invited respondents to share suggestions on how ISC20C might further enhance the document's usefulness and dissemination, and how to encourage its broader application.

5.2 Summary of Responses

The first question in this section asked whether National Committees have found the MNDD useful in caring for twentieth-century heritage places (see Figure 5.1).




Figure 5.1: Pie chart showing how useful National Committees have found the MNDD. Response numbers appear inside the pie chart.

A majority of responses reported that they found the MNDD useful (52%) or very useful (24%)—representing a strong outcome for this long-term ISC20C initiative. However, some (14%) stated that they had never heard of the document, and a few (9%) stated that they had not found it useful.

The second question asked respondents to describe how the MNDD document is being used in their respective countries, or to explain why it has not been used. Responses to this open-ended question revealed that, although many indicated awareness of the document and assessed it positively—finding it useful or very useful—they either didn’t know how it was being used more broadly in their country (10), or reported that the document was not officially used and it had only limited known application in their country (10). In some cases, responses described individual or professional use rather than institutional uptake. For example, the respondent for Jordan explained that “the MNDD has been used on an individual level. I have used it personally and found it very useful. I have used it when working on development of Intervention Guidelines for 20th century heritage (Modern Heritage) in Abu Dhabi, UAE. I have also used it when working on adaptive reuse projects of 20th century heritage in Jordan and in the UAE.”

Several responses indicated that the MNDD is primarily used in academic contexts, including research (10) and teaching (3). For example, Venezuela noted that “this document is known, has been disseminated, and is applied in the work of the Master's Program in Conservation and Restoration of Monuments, affiliated with the Central University of Venezuela. Similarly, it is conceptually recognized and applied by researchers, restoration architects, and managers of Modern Heritage in Venezuela.”

Other responses described its role as a reference document (7). Poland stated that the MNDD is used “as inspiration and supporting material. It is not a leading document in national practice,” while Saudi Arabia noted that it is used “by Saudi ICOMOS as a reference,” and Uruguay referred to it “as a general frame of reference.”

Four responses reported that the MNDD has influenced conservation practice. For example, Argentina stated that “it has been used especially by professionals who undertake conservation projects and works in heritage properties of the twentieth-century.” Belgium observed that while “its adoption and specific applications in Belgium are not explicitly documented in public sources,” the MNDD has “been instrumental in guiding Belgian conservation practices.”

Two responses described its use in government-related work. The Abu Dhabi respondent reported that “it has fully informed the Executive Guidelines for the Cultural Heritage Law of Abu Dhabi and also is followed when we develop our conservation management plans and our approaches to interventions.” Similarly, China noted that they used the guidance of the MNDD in developing its 20th Century programme.

One response mentioned its use in advocacy, and one in dealing with stakeholders. Australia explained that “the MNDD is strongly based on the Burra Charter principles anyway which form the key national reference in Australian practice,” and that it “is very useful with stakeholders to demonstrate international interest and methods.”

A few responses stated that they had not been aware of this document before, but they discovered it through this survey. For example, the Dominican Republic commented that “we were not aware of the document, and we understand that the government authorities in charge of preserving the cultural heritage of the Dominican Republic have not put it into practice. Now we have had the opportunity to learn about it and study it and we are sure that it is a fundamental tool to put into practice when intervening on 20th century heritage, and for its conservation, protection and preservation.”

Two responses explained why they did not find the MNDD useful. The Netherlands noted that “the MNDD document is hardly used in our country, while there is already a deeply rooted conservation and adaptive reuse practice of 20C heritage in our country; alterations, permits etc. are nowadays submitted to recent legislation on the built environment.” France stated that the “MNDD does not provide any additional elements relevant to the French system” to safeguard listed twentieth-century buildings. However, they acknowledged that the document can be a useful tool for preserving unprotected heritage sites.

The third question invited respondents to suggest actions that ISC20C could take to make the MNDD more useful or more widely used in their respective countries. This was an open-ended question with examples such as publishing an illustrated version, conducting workshops, and developing explanatory videos included in the question (see Figure 5.2).

Is there anything that the ISC20C can do to make the MNDD more useful or broadly used in your country (e.g. publish an illustrated version, workshops, develop a short video explaining its content and possible applications)?




Figure 5.2: Suggested actions for ISC20C to make the MNDD more useful or more broadly used. Response numbers are shown at the end of each bar.

Workshops, seminars, and webinars emerged as the most frequently requested action, with 27 responses mentioning them. Many responses emphasized the importance of targeting specific audiences, focusing on national or regional contexts, and partnering with National Committees to deliver such actions. Argentina suggested developing workshops “with the participation of ISC20C and the ICOMOS National Committee, aimed at professionals and academia, as well as the development of a short video in Spanish.” Canada’s response recommended that “ISC20C might consider organizing a webinar or a workshop, partnering with ICOMOS Canada, to target the Canadian audience, to illustrate the relevance of the document in our country,” while Singapore emphasized the importance of including various stakeholders, suggesting “conducting workshops and webinars with participants from government agencies, academia, practitioners, tertiary students.”

Several responses emphasized the effectiveness of participatory workshop formats. Chile noted that “workshop-type activities, although they involve few participants, are the ones that generate the most understanding and, consequently, greater awareness and ideally, commitment.”

Requests for visual and digital materials were also prominent. A total of 21 responses requested video content, and 16 requested an illustrated version or visual materials, reflecting the growing demand for accessible resources that can be easily shared and disseminated, including via social media. Australia stated that “an illustrated version would be great. A YouTube video about how it works would be practically helpful too,”

while Cyprus emphasized that videos in local languages would “ensure effectiveness.” Jordan proposed publishing “successful conservation projects that used the MNDD,” and Costa Rica advocated the need “to publish new printed and digital editions with a contemporary perspective and to conduct innovative workshops.”

Five responses emphasized the need for targeted outreach to government agencies and heritage institutions, and for involving them in its dissemination. Belgium suggested that the MNDD “should be promoted more through the official heritage agencies,” while the Dominican Republic highlighted the need to “share an illustrated version, physical or digital, with the government authorities responsible for the conservation of cultural heritage (Executive Branch, Ministry of Culture, National Directorate of Monumental Heritage, Municipal Councils).”

Despite the MNDD’s translation into 19 languages as of December 2025, translation emerged as a persistent request. Responses cited language barriers and requested translations into Hebrew, Lithuanian, Polish, Macedonian, and Dutch, as well as the translation of educational materials created to promote it, such as videos and case studies.

Four responses requested case studies and practical examples to demonstrate real-world application of the MNDD, reflecting a desire to bridge the gap between the principles expressed in the document and conservation practice. The United Kingdom stated that “case studies are helpful to demonstrate application and use in practice.” Denmark suggested disseminating case studies illustrating “how could the use of the MNDD document have changed the outcome of a particular (well-known) case? How could it add value to a case already done?” India argued that “the most effective way of persuading practitioners to apply the MNDD principles in their work on 20C Heritage would be to conduct workshops based around actual case examples both of completed and potential projects, illustrating the advantages that would accrue through its use.”

Many responses emphasized the need to promote the document, at the national level, targeting multiple stakeholders. Suggestions ranged from Belgium proposing that “it should be promoted more through the official heritage agencies,” Italy recommending targeting multiple stakeholder groups by promoting “dissemination/education activities for: 1) Ministry of culture and its bodies, 2) Universities, 3) Professional Associations, 4) Cultural associations.” Nepal noted that “ICOMOS Nepal will need to adapt this to local examples and publicize.” Ireland observed that “global seminars are useful in terms of learning from other countries but people relate most to what is familiar and local to them,” and Poland commented that “the task is on the Polish side. It is advisable to translate the document and promote it more widely.” Chile emphasized engaging user communities to foster understanding of modernity as heritage, stating that “a direct approach to user communities is essential to help them understand the

values of modernity—not as something old, but as part of antiquity and history that deserves the same respect as other heritage assets.”

Several responses identified specific contextual challenges requiring tailored solutions. China requested context-specific adaptation: “In the framework of China's legal system for the protection of cultural relics and in the context of China's actual situation, revise the MNDD in accordance with the Cultural Relics Protection Law... and formulate a guiding document for the refinement and deepening of the determination, protection, management and utilisation study.” Bulgaria pointed to the broader and more fundamental challenge of “getting public appreciation of the qualities/values of sites and creating a heritage conservation attitude towards them.”

A small number of responses (2) indicated that additional dissemination was unnecessary due to existing robust heritage protection systems. The United States of America noted that the “USA has a well established methodology and practice already—MNDD is a more contemporary approach but given 20thC heritage is largely already mainstreamed into heritage practice it may be of lesser need here.” Similarly, the Netherlands acknowledged a potentially limited impact, stating that “eventually, a translated version in our language might help to make the MNDD better known in our country, but it is doubtful if that availability would make a substantial difference for the current practices.”

The final question asked whether countries had developed national reference documents, guidelines, and good practices focused on the conservation of twentieth-century heritage places (see Figure 5.3).

A majority of responses (52%) reported that their countries had not developed such documents. A total of 25 responses (39%) indicated that they had, with several providing references (see Appendix IX). A few responses (4%) were uncertain, and the remaining (3%) did not provide an answer.




Figure 5.3: Map showing countries that have developed reference documents focused on the conservation of twentieth-century heritage places.

5.3 Key Findings

Despite widespread awareness of the MNDD and recognition of its value being evident in survey responses, a disconnect remains between individual appreciation of the document and its broader adoption and use. A total of 20 responses out of 63 indicated limited or no use in their countries, with some suggesting a lack of awareness and insufficient dissemination, or limited integration with existing legislative frameworks.

The frequent mention of MNDD as a “reference” reflects its intended role as an international guidance tool and as a support in advocating for the application of appropriate conservation approaches to twentieth-century places. It was not intended to be a governing document or primary policy statement.

The predominant use of the MNDD is reported in academic contexts (research and teaching), and the limited application in professional practice points to a lack of awareness among practitioners and limited reference to the document in national policies. While some responses, such as those from China and the Abu Dhabi Emirate, have highlighted how the MNDD principles have been effectively applied in government work and integrated into heritage policies, other responses, such as those from the Netherlands and France, cite pre-existing robust systems as reasons for the limited application of MNDD. This suggests that its application in government work may correlate with the maturity and flexibility of existing twentieth-century heritage protection frameworks.

The responses reveal a need for more dissemination efforts of the MNDD, with workshops and visual materials emerging as the most requested options. The emphasis on workshops, seminars, and webinars reflects a recognition that effective implementation requires active engagement and discussion rather than passive document distribution, and a preference for country-specific events with strong involvement of National Committees and local stakeholders.

The demand for visual and digital resources indicates a shift toward contemporary communication preferences. Responses consistently requested modern formats, such as videos and social media posts, to reach broader audiences and provide practical guidance through real-world examples.

Translation requests underscore that, despite the document being available in 19 languages, language remains a barrier limiting its global impact. Moreover, the need for localization extends beyond translation to cultural and legal contexts, as illustrated by China's request for a framework-specific adaptation.

The call for case studies and practical examples suggests that while the MNDD's principles are recognized and valued, practitioners need practical examples of applying the MNDD. This indicates an opportunity to develop a companion resource that bridges the gap between guiding principles and their practical application.

Despite the ISC20C's consultative development, multilingual translation, and dissemination of the document since 2011, and its formal publication and endorsement at the 2017 General Assembly, it is evident that the document has not been effectively promoted to ICOMOS National Committees or included in the official lists of ICOMOS doctrinal texts. Whilst this reflects the committees' volunteer resource realities to date, it also suggests a high priority for future action.

6. Looking Back: Evolution and Changes Since 2000

6.1 Introduction

This section of the survey examined how conservation practice related to twentieth-century heritage has evolved since 2001, when the MAP20 survey was initiated. The survey questions invited respondents to reflect on developments over the past two decades, asking them to assess trends in the identification, management, and conservation of twentieth-century heritage places, as well as to evaluate both improvements and ongoing challenges.

The questions explored changes in heritage legislation and sought to identify where policies specifically addressing the conservation of twentieth-century heritage have been developed. In addition, the survey aimed to identify and compile national references and documents, as well as identify the main national or local organizations involved in the conservation of twentieth-century heritage.

6.2 Summary of Responses

The first question in this section of the survey asked respondents to assess how key issues affecting twentieth-century heritage places have changed over the past two decades (see Figure 6.1). Respondents were invited to evaluate nine issues and indicate whether each had “significantly improved,” “improved,” “stayed the same,” “worsened,” or “significantly worsened.”

Since 2001, how have key issues changed regarding Twentieth-century heritage places in your country?




Figure 6.1: Respondents' assessments of how nine key issues affecting twentieth-century heritage places have changed over the past two decades. Response numbers are indicated in each section of the bars.

Overall, the results indicate substantial progress across several dimensions. A significant majority of responses (over 75%) reported improvements in six of the nine key issues.

The greatest improvement was observed in *public appreciation of twentieth-century heritage*, with 97% of responses indicating improvement or significant improvement. Only 3% reported that appreciation had remained largely unchanged (Greece and Serbia), and no response reported a decline.

Similarly significant levels of improvement were reported for the *inclusion of twentieth-century heritage in surveys, studies, and inventories*, with 94% of responses noting improvement or significant improvement and the remaining 6% reporting no change (Armenia, Greece, New Zealand, and Nigeria). No responses reported a deterioration in inclusion.

Advocacy for twentieth-century heritage was also perceived to have strengthened considerably, with 89% of responses reporting improvement. A smaller group (8%) indicated that advocacy had remained unchanged (Colombia, Denmark, Greece, the Abu Dhabi Emirate, and Serbia), while a very small proportion (3%) reported a worsening situation (Brazil and Nigeria).

Improvements in *general knowledge among audiences and owners* were also widely reported, with 76% of responses indicating improvement or significant improvement and 24% stating that conditions had stayed the same across a wide range of countries (Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Jordan, Mexico, Morocco, the Abu Dhabi Emirate, the Philippines, and South Africa). None reported it had worsened.

Strong improvements were also observed in relation to *information on modern materials and construction technologies* and for *technical and professional expertise*, with 75% of responses in both cases reporting improvement or significant improvement, and the remainder indicating no change.

More mixed results were reported for the remaining three issues. A majority of responses (59%) perceived *legal protection for twentieth-century heritage* to have improved, while 35% felt it had remained unchanged. However, 6% reported that legal protection had worsened (Czech Republic, Denmark, Nigeria, and Türkiye), suggesting uneven progress and, in some contexts, regression.

Incentives for conservation also showed modest improvement overall. Just over half of responses (56%) reported improvement or significant improvement, while one-third indicated no change. A small proportion reported worsening conditions (6%) (Australia, Denmark, Finland, and Hungary), with a further 2% indicating significant

deterioration in incentives (Nigeria). A small number of responses reported insufficient information to assess this issue.

The least progress was reported regarding the *availability of guidelines*, with fewer than half of responses (43%) perceiving improvement. A majority (54%) felt that the situation had remained unchanged (Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Moldova, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Türkiye, and Venezuela), and one response reported deterioration or uncertainty (Jordan). This result points to a persistent gap between growing recognition and advocacy for twentieth-century heritage and the availability of practical guidance to support its effective conservation.

The second question in this section explored perceptions of *why* conditions for the conservation of twentieth-century heritage places have changed in each country (see Figure 6.2). As this was an open-ended question, the responses have been analyzed using keywords, based on the interpretation of the answers, to produce a quantitative overview. Responses frequently identified more than one factor contributing to change.




Figure 6.2: Respondents' assessments of factors contributing to change. The analysis was carried out using keywords. Keywords associated with positive change are shown in green, while those associated with adverse impacts are shown in red. The number of responses that mentioned each keyword is shown in each bar.

By a considerable margin, *increased public appreciation and advocacy* emerged as the most influential driver of change, mentioned by 70% of responses.

This may be linked to multiple, interrelated dynamics, including the inevitably growing “age value” of twentieth-century heritage, generational change among heritage professionals, and a broader cultural re-evaluation of the modern built environment. Responses suggested that younger generations may be more inclined to recognize the heritage values of twentieth-century places, influenced in part by a temporal distance, popular interest in retro culture, media exposure, and tourism to sites and cities celebrated for their modern heritage, such as Miami and Cuba. Social media was also noted as an important factor in spreading appreciation of twentieth-century heritage through graphic and visual means.

These dynamics were articulated clearly by responses from several contexts. In the Abu Dhabi Emirate, for example, the respondent noted that the “new generation is interested in heritage places they can relate to. Due to fast paced development, these are their spatial anchors and landmarks of their collective memory.” In Algeria, the respondent noted renewed interest in twentieth-century heritage as being driven by ambitious urban modernization projects, with the respondent observing that “over the past two decades, as part of ambitious modernization projects in major Algerian cities (such as Algiers, Oran and Constantine), renewed interest in the built heritage, including 20th-century buildings within these urban ensembles, has been driven in particular by the prospects of modernization, tourism development and the regional and international influence of these cities.”

In Bulgaria, the passage of time itself was seen as a decisive factor: “For pre-war heritage it is mostly the time distance that triggers increased recognition and appreciation for modernist architecture.” In Israel, “more awareness due to conservation activities and initiatives of ICOMOS, Docomomo and research institutions. The declaration of Tel Aviv as a UNESCO World Heritage Site contributed significantly to public awareness and professional development and tourism.”

Several responses also emphasized the role of civil society advocacy in reshaping public attitudes and driving change. In some cases, major losses or threats to iconic twentieth-century places served as catalysts for public mobilization and sustained advocacy campaigns, as reported in countries such as Singapore, Norway, Türkiye, and the United Kingdom. In several countries, advocacy was explicitly described as a response to threats of demolition. Singapore, for example, recalled that there has been “more developed awareness and appreciation of significance of 20th C heritage places since civil society advocacy efforts against the demolition of National Library, a post-war modern landmark,” adding that since 2019, advocacy by DOCOMOMO Singapore, Singapore Heritage Society, and ICOMOS Singapore had “catalysed conservation of Singapore’s first post-independence privately owned large building, the Golden Mile Complex.” Similar pressures were noted in Mexico, where change was attributed to “the civil society working groups demanding the authorities” act.

Broader environmental considerations were increasingly cited as supporting the rationale for conservation, particularly regarding sustainability and embodied carbon. France observed that “the situation has evolved in a positive direction, because in France there is a remarkable mobilization of associations and advocacy groups, but legislative provisions are rarely applied and the Architecture contemporaine remarquable (ACR) label remains too ineffective legally in the event of a demolition intent. Today, this mobilization is linked to energy improvements.” However, responses also cautioned that new energy-efficiency requirements may generate unintended risks to modern heritage through maladaptation initiatives (see Section 7 of this report).

Academic research was identified as another major factor driving change, mentioned in 33% of responses, which highlighted the expansion of research, documentation, and scholarly engagement with twentieth-century heritage as contributing to its improved recognition and understanding. China noted that “the number of 20th century architectural heritage [places] listed in the national key cultural relics protection units has significantly increased in comparison with that of the period before 2001, and the implementation of related protection projects has been more extensive and larger in scale, and special research on several types of 20th century heritage has been carried out. Academics have produced a wealth of research results on 20th century architectural heritage in the form of scientific research projects, books, translations and theses.”

In Croatia, the emergence of new scholarship was linked both to international trends and to a critical reassessment of the socialist past, with the response noting that “in line with international trends, but also as a protest against 1990s renunciation of the socialist past, which also included the process of modernization, in the past 25 years, new scholars emerged with clearer scientific focus on architectural heritage of the post-Second-World War period.” In Poland, generational change within academia was again emphasized, stating that “the most important thing is the development of research. There is a big difference in understanding the heritage from the mid-20th century and the later one from the second half of the 20th century. It is important to give voice to the next generations, for whom the 20th century is only history and not the area of their own experiences.”

Improved legal protection and World Heritage listings were cited in 28% of responses as significant factors influencing change. Responses frequently emphasized the catalytic effect of World Heritage inscription in stimulating national and local recognition, funding, and professional capacity.

India identified a combination of “triggers that have helped to accelerate the movement for recognising and conserving Twentieth-century heritage,” including “the inscription of Chandigarh’s Capitol and other 20C places on the World Heritage List and the Tentative List, the demolition of or threats to 20C icons, the inventories and similar

work on 20C heritage by numerous members of the academia, wider availability of literature on 20C places in India and, 20C projects selected for the World Monuments Watch and Getty's 'Keeping it Modern Initiative'."

Similar effects of World Heritage inscription were described in Israel as mentioned above and Venezuela, where "the declaration of the Ciudad Universitaria de Caracas (2001) [as World Heritage] marked a significant change in the recognition and value of 20th-century architecture. This event promoted the acknowledgment of the country's modern architecture and its exceptional value nationally and internationally. It also highlighted the technical difficulties associated with its protection and rehabilitation."

By contrast, a smaller but significant group of responses emphasized negative factors affecting conservation outcomes over the last two decades. *Reduced funding, weaker regulation, and limited government action* were mentioned by 19% of responses, while *material decay, financial pressure, and urban development pressure* were cited by 17% of responses.

The Australian response referred to "less commitment by the government to investing in heritage conservation guidance and statutory protection." Similarly, in Israel, "there is insufficient funding for conservation and heritage in other places, due to insufficient awareness and withdrawal of funding by the government."

In Costa Rica, the dominance of real estate interests was identified as a key challenge: "The conservation of the values of 20th-century sites and properties has been increasingly neglected due to the dominance of financial and business interests from the real estate market and the construction industry."

In Denmark, issues included "accelerating decay (age, climate changes, air pollution)" in addition to "high urbanisation pressure on the green open spaces that are significant for 20th-century heritage. ...Bigger private investors and developers with direct contact with decision-makers, able to put rising political pressure, etc. Increasing political prioritising of private property rights at the expense of community values."

The Türkiye response described how "the major reason for negative changes is the global political and economic pressure for urban transformation and regeneration, which threatens 20C heritage places and increases the rate of their destruction... Additionally, the structure and expertise of the Regional Conservation Boards deteriorated since academic members on the boards were replaced with non-expert practitioners."

Finally, *training and improved professional knowledge* were identified by a smaller number of responses (11%) as positively contributing to change, alongside a range of other contextual factors (22%). The response from Chile observed that "both academic

and professional knowledge on the topic of modern heritage conservation have been developing and improving.” France noted that improved education in architecture schools was highlighted as contributing to better-prepared professionals: “Teaching at architecture schools is broader than it used to be in 20th century architecture, including constructive systems, and the teaching of intervention on existing buildings (2005 law) provides better training for young architects.”

The third question in this section asked National Committees whether, since the MAP20 survey in 2001, there had been changes to national heritage legislation or the introduction of specific policies or incentives to support the conservation and management of twentieth-century heritage places. 49% of the responses reported such changes had occurred, while 41% indicated that no changes had taken place, and 10% stated that they did not know.

Those who answered affirmatively were invited, in a second part of the question, to describe the changes and provide references, including internet links where available (see Figure 6.3). As this was an open-ended question, responses were analyzed using keywords.

Since the first ISC20C survey in 2001, have there been any changes to the heritage legislation or the introduction of specific policies or incentives to support the conservation /management of Twentieth-century heritage places in your country?




Figure 6.3: Respondents’ assessments of changes to heritage legislation or policies in the last twenty years. The analysis was carried out using keywords. The number of responses for each keyword is shown in the bar.

The majority of those who reported legislative or policy changes—21 of the 31 responses (68%)—indicated that these changes involved the introduction of *new laws or policies affording new or increased protection to twentieth-century heritage*. In several countries, this took the form of removing explicit chronological limits that had previously excluded twentieth-century places from statutory protection. Bulgaria, for example, explained that “in 2009 a new Cultural Heritage Law was introduced. It did not put any time limit for listing, unlike the previous law that required sites to be built

before World War Two to be listed.” Similarly, in the Russian Federation, legislative reform was described as having explicitly extended protection to twentieth-century heritage, with the respondent noting that “a new version of the National Heritage Law – Federal Law 73-FZ on objects of cultural heritage – was approved in 2002. Twentieth-century heritage is protected by this legislation.”

However, responses also emphasized that legislative change did not always translate into effective recognition or protection in practice. Bulgaria, for instance, noted that while the removal of a chronological limit represented a positive step, “the change came with no explanation on the values of post war heritage, thus leaving its values on huge discussion and extreme disagreements in public society.” This lack of accompanying guidance and interpretation, combined with the “multiplicity and diversity” of post-war heritage, was said to have resulted in very slow progress in identification and listing compared to places from earlier centuries.

Only two responses referred specifically to *new policies aimed at raising public awareness and appreciation of twentieth-century heritage*. In Belgium, the response highlighted the role of public-facing initiatives, noting that “Heritage Days. Regional heritage days often included 20th-century themes, raising public awareness and appreciation for modern architecture.” In Lithuania, a broader range of initiatives was described, combining research, publications, public festivals, and World Heritage recognition: “Scientific research and published books regarding the 20th-century heritage are increasing in our country. Festivals like Open House Vilnius or Buildings Talk in Lithuania also contribute to broader recognition and appreciation of 20th-century heritage. Of course, the inclusion of Kaunas Modernist Architecture in the UNESCO WHL contributes significantly to a more comprehensive understanding and appreciation of 20th-century heritage.”

Two responses identified the introduction of *tax incentives or financial measures* supporting heritage as benefiting the conservation of twentieth-century places. The Australian response noted that “relatively few incentives” exist, with an exception being a “recent update for heritage places of the transfer of development rights (applies to all heritage places).” Israel responded that “some new policies have been applied in Tel Aviv and other major cities, introducing incentives in specific cases for conservation of 20th century modern heritage.”

Other types of changes affecting the recognition of twentieth-century heritage were also reported. In Poland, for example, incremental legislative and policy developments were highlighted, including the introduction of the concept of “contemporary cultural property” through an amendment to the Spatial Planning Act in 2003, and a 2016 declaration that “officially opened the way to recognizing works from the second half of the 20th century as monuments.”

The Brazilian response described broader constitutional and policy developments, explaining that “the Federal constitution (1988) has expanded the range of cultural heritage, focusing on Intangible Heritage. Cultural Heritage policies IPHAN (2018).”

Several responses stressed that legislative change has not always been positive, and that the absence of strong promotional frameworks or adequate resources has sometimes led to uneven outcomes.

In Denmark, while a 1997 revision lowering the age threshold from 100 years to 50 years was identified as significant, the response cautioned that “it has not been followed up by new resources. However, the main effort has been to describe the already listed buildings.” In Finland, concern was expressed about the potential weakening of protection, stating that a “new law was introduced in 2020. New process is going on if the proposed law goes further, the result will worsen the meaning protection.” France referred to the 2016 Law on Freedom of Creation, Architecture and Heritage (LCAP) and the introduction of the ‘Remarkable Contemporary Architecture’ label but emphasized its limitations in practice, noting that “the legal force of the label remains ineffective.” The Netherlands response described the abolition of the 50-year minimum age requirement in 2012, which was accompanied by restrictive designation practices that limited protection to the “top 100” sites: “At the national level, the major change has been that the minimum age requirement of ‘50 years’ has been abolished in the Historic Buildings and Monuments Act in 2012. However, when in 2007 the first series of post-war monuments was designated for legal protection...the Ministry of Culture had stipulated that only a ‘top 100’ was eligible...The same restriction was applied for the next series of ‘top 100’ post-war-reconstruction monuments...which turned out to contain only 90 ...In both cases also a positive perspective for future (re)use was required, and consent by the owners, although these requirements are not mentioned in the legislation...Meanwhile, municipalities and provinces have further developed their own policies for listing and protecting young 20C heritage, also benefiting from the growing network of heritage specialists, interested academics and various NGOs and pressure groups.”

While nearly half of responses reported legislative or policy changes since 2001, these changes vary widely in scope, effectiveness, and practical impact. In many cases, reforms have expanded the formal eligibility of twentieth-century heritage for protection, but without adequate resources, guidance, incentives, or public communication, thereby limiting their transformative potential.

The fourth question within this section aimed to compile publications and online resources focused on the conservation of twentieth-century heritage in each country. These references are presented in Appendix X of this report.

Responses varied considerably: some offered only general descriptions without specific references, while others provided full citations to published works and online

resources. The publications identified included historical research, inventories, thematic studies, case studies, and general guidance documents. It is notable, however, that many of these are primarily historiographic in nature and do not specifically address conservation issues or offer reflections on conservation practice. Armenia, Croatia, Iceland, Mexico, Moldova, Nepal, Nigeria, North Macedonia, and Norway reported the absence of national publications specifically focused on the conservation of twentieth-century heritage. Although globally incomplete, these references may be valuable for research and the development of an online database.

The fifth and final question in this section of the survey invited respondents to identify up to ten civic, national, or local groups active in the conservation of twentieth-century heritage in their country and to briefly describe their activities (see Figure 6.4). Respondents were also invited to provide links to relevant websites and resources.

Across the responses, five categories of organizations were most cited: DOCOMOMO (48% of the total), ICOMOS and ICOMOS ISC20C (40%), national institutes, foundations, and ministries (24%), national professional councils (22%), and academic or educational institutions (19%). Besides those, other groups were cited in 67% of responses.

DOCOMOMO and ICOMOS, with their various subcommittees/branches—including the ISC20C—emerged as the organizations most consistently identified as active in twentieth-century heritage conservation in the responding countries.




Figure 6.4: Respondents' assessments of civic, national, or local groups identified as active in twentieth-century heritage conservation. The analysis was carried out using keywords. The number of responses for each keyword is shown in the bar.

Some responses identified only organizations focusing exclusively on twentieth-century heritage, while others listed organizations concerned with heritage from all

periods, including the twentieth century (Appendix XI). This variation has resulted in an imbalance evident in the chart above.

6.3 Key Findings

Overall, the responses perceived a general improvement in twentieth-century heritage conservation practice over the past two decades, since the initial MAP20 survey (conducted between 2001 and 2004/5). The areas seen as having improved the most relate to legislative protection, alongside increased appreciation and knowledge of twentieth-century heritage places. However, this growth in public awareness remains uneven across regions and even across the same country.

Improvements in identification and documentation are reflected in the expanded inclusion of twentieth-century sites in surveys and inventories, which in turn have supported their legal protection. Legislative amendments have also reduced barriers to listing (such as age thresholds) or broadened listing criteria (for example, through the recognition of social values). Increased academic research and education about twentieth-century heritage have also played a significant role in enhancing both appreciation and protection.

More than half of the responses reported the introduction of new protective legislation. However, several noted a gradual withdrawal or reduction of government support for heritage protection generally in the last decade. As a result, even where appropriate protective legislation exists, it is not always effectively implemented due to limited resources or political will.

Responses also noted that the increased inclusion of modern sites on the World Heritage List has been beneficial in raising public awareness and in promoting greater attention to the conservation of twentieth-century heritage by national and local agencies, with increasing tentative list inclusions further raising the profile of modern heritage. World Heritage practice has been an area where the ISC20C has been particularly active since its establishment, providing support through technical advice, projects like TCHTF, missions, and desk reviews of nominations, as well as state of conservation reports.

The responses underscore the key role of civil society and non-profit organizations in advocacy and listing campaigns, including both the international organizations with national branches (such as DOCOMOMO and ICOMOS) and nationally based ones such as National Trusts and specific NGOs such as the Twentieth Century Society and the Association for Preservation Technology (APT).

Responses highlighted growing experience with awareness-raising campaigns and promotional initiatives, much of which could be usefully shared and adapted across organizations, institutions, different levels of governments, and internationally. Local

initiatives such as Canberra Modern in Australia and Modernism Week at Palm Springs in the USA were cited.

However, many responses perceived the availability of conservation guidelines specific to twentieth-century heritage as insufficient. Despite the expansion of academic research in this field and the activities of the ISC20C in developing its two major guidelines documents—neither of which is formally recognized by ICOMOS—technical conservation resources remain scarce and underdeveloped. This issue is further discussed in Section 5 of this report, addressing the *Madrid–New Delhi Document*.

The references and case studies submitted constitute a substantial body of pertinent material, including inventories, surveys, and architectural history sources. However, comparatively fewer works deal specifically with design and technology or conservation practice related to twentieth-century heritage. Nonetheless, the resources mentioned in the survey responses are valuable for both professionals and academics and are available in the Appendices.

7. Looking Ahead: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities

7.1 Introduction

This section of the survey examined the key factors that are either hindering or supporting the conservation of twentieth-century heritage, while also highlighting the main trends, challenges, and opportunities identified by ICOMOS respondent committees and individuals.

In the survey questions, particular attention was given to the issue of climate change, exploring how its impacts are already affecting the conservation of twentieth-century heritage places today; how different countries are responding to these challenges; and what measures are being taken to prepare for the future, both in terms of mitigation and adaptation actions.

7.2 Summary of Responses

The first question explored how 15 key issues are adversely impacting twentieth-century heritage in each country (see Figure 7.1). The key issues comprised recurring and common problems related to twentieth-century heritage conservation, and the respondents were asked to rank each of them from “not affecting at all” to “very strongly affecting” twentieth-century heritage in their country.

On a scale 1 to 5, how are the following issues adversely impacting Twentieth-century heritage in your country?



Figure 7.1: Respondents' ratings of how strongly 15 key issues are adversely impacting twentieth-century heritage in their country, on a scale from 1 (not affecting at all) to 5 (very

strongly affecting). The number of responses identifying each issue is shown at the end of each bar.

The three issues “very strongly” affecting and “strongly” affecting the conservation of twentieth-century heritage that were identified by the responses are:

- impacts of urban development and redevelopment pressure;
- insufficient financial resources or incentives that support twentieth-century heritage places; and
- incompatible alterations and change.

The next most impactful group of issues are:

- risk of incompatible alterations/interventions to increase energy efficiency;
- impact of functional redundancy/obsolescence, loss of original use;
- lack of legal protection/support by the authorities;
- lack of value public appreciation of twentieth-century heritage;
- frequency of needing heritage advocacy;
- lack of a comprehensive survey of twentieth-century heritage;
- insufficient legal protection for twentieth-century heritage places even when listed;
- technical challenges in conserving modern materials and building technologies; and
- listing constraints [which] mean that significant twentieth-century heritage places are not being legally protected.

Issues selected by fewer than half of responses are:

- impacts of climate change on twentieth-century heritage;
- insufficient professional knowledge/expertise accessible to support the conservation of twentieth-century heritage places; and
- impact of war or targeted destruction/damage.

The question also allowed respondents to select “Other” and provide additional comments. A small number of responses raised issues not explicitly listed in the survey. Poland and the Czech Republic highlighted challenges related to acceptance and appreciation, noting respectively “diversity of social acceptance of heritage until the mid-20th century and after the mid-20th century. Difficulties in accepting the post-communist heritage,” and that it is a “significant part of the heritage, Architecture from 1948-1989, is associated with the socialist political regime. This is perceived as a significantly negative factor, regardless of whether the architecture itself actually shows this association.”

France identified a “lack of maintenance interventions” as a key issue, while Norway pointed to a “lack of thematic and contextual knowledge to inform appraisals.” Spain further elaborated on the impacts of climate change, explaining that “extreme weather

events such as storms and floods are causing severe damage to 20th-century buildings, which are particularly vulnerable due to the use of modern construction materials and techniques, which may not be as durable or resilient as traditional ones. Many 20th-century buildings were built in urban or coastal areas that are more exposed to extreme weather events.”

The second question in this section of the survey invited respondents who indicated that climate change is adversely affecting twentieth-century heritage to describe how these impacts are manifesting (see Figure 7.2). This question received 47 open-ended responses, which were analyzed using keywords.

Many responses observed that climate change threatens all heritage places, regardless of age, citing universal risks such as flooding, storms, rising temperatures, landslides, and increasingly frequent extreme weather events. At the same time, some responses identified a range of vulnerabilities that are specific to twentieth-century heritage. These relate in particular to construction typologies—such as flat roofs and extensive glazed façades—and to materials that are often less resilient, durable, or energy efficient than traditional ones. Several responses also noted that twentieth-century heritage places are frequently located in areas more exposed to climate risks, including coastal zones.

If you selected that climate change is adversely impacting Twentieth-century heritage, please describe how.




Figure 7.2: Respondents’ assessment of the impacts of climate change on twentieth-century heritage. A total of 47 responses were analyzed using keywords. The number of responses associated with each keyword is shown at the end of each bar. Multiple keywords may have been associated with the same response.

A large number of responses (21) pointed to accelerated *material and physical deterioration* as a primary impact of climate change on twentieth-century heritage. Reinforced concrete, wood, metals, and other modern construction materials were cited as being particularly vulnerable, especially where traditional protective design features such as roof eaves or gutters are absent. The respondent for Abu Dhabi noted that “high heat and high humidity is also accelerating deterioration of reinforced

concrete.” The response from Brazil similarly emphasized the vulnerability of modern buildings to material decay, citing “acceleration of the deterioration and flooding processes of sites located on the coast due to rising sea levels; increased infiltration and drainage problems in buildings and sites due to increased rainfall, considering the absence (in many cases) of traditional weather protection elements - such as roof eaves, lintels and gutters; acceleration of the deterioration processes of concrete elements due to rising temperatures and relative humidity, as well as the concentration of pollutants.” Chile reported that “the increase in torrential rains saturates the already carbonated concrete mass, promoting the oxidation of the internal reinforcement.”

Responses from colder and temperate climates also highlighted the role of increasingly extreme temperature variations. The Canadian response observed that “the extreme summer and winter temperatures, the unusual water and snow precipitation patterns, unusually strong storms and winds have a strong impact on the existing buildings, requiring interventions to adapt them to the new weather conditions or more continuous maintenance efforts.” Lithuania similarly noted that rising temperatures, floods, and heat and cold waves are damaging the physical condition of modern heritage.

In tropical and humid contexts, biological growth was identified as a major threat. The responses from the Dominican Republic, Nepal, and Saudi Arabia all pointed to increased rainfall, humidity, and higher temperatures as accelerating biological growth and material deterioration.

Many responses (19) described multiple threats posed by *natural disasters* to twentieth-century heritage places, including sea-level rise, flooding, changing rainfall patterns, storms, droughts, and rising temperatures. Australia emphasized the impacts of “increasing intense/extreme rainfall impacting drainage, extended drought periods affecting C20 landscapes and gardens, rising sea levels impacting coastal infrastructure, landscapes and buildings including the Sydney Opera House, harbour infrastructure etc.” Cyprus and France both highlighted coastal erosion and the potential disappearance of structures due to rising sea levels. Portugal similarly stated that “the rise of sea water level in coastal heritage is an issue in Portugal due to the density of demographics in the seashore,” while the United States of America confirmed that coastal areas are particularly at risk. Venezuela warned that “the rise in sea levels directly threatens populations near the coast, including cities with important 20th-century heritage like Maracaibo.”

Extreme weather events were widely reported. Denmark cited storm damage, groundwater rise, and biodiversity loss. Italy pointed to “extreme rainfall challenging drainage systems in concrete buildings” and increased wildfire risk. Japan and Nepal both emphasized damage caused by heavy rains, typhoons, and storms. Spain reiterated that “extreme weather events such as storms and floods are causing severe damage to 20th-century buildings.”

A recurring theme across responses was the pressure to retrofit twentieth-century buildings to meet energy-efficiency requirements or to accommodate cooling systems in response to rising temperatures, often resulting in *inappropriate alterations or interventions that compromise heritage values to increase energy efficiency or cope with climate change* (18 responses).

Argentina noted that air-conditioning units are frequently installed in an unsympathetic manner on façades to address rising heat. Bulgaria referred to energy-efficiency measures and European energy regulations that lead to invasive interventions, while Cyprus observed that installing cooling systems in response to rising temperatures “may compromise the historical integrity of the buildings.” Hungary reported accelerated replacement of windows and the application of thermal insulation driven by the energy crisis, often using low-quality solutions.

Ireland provided a broader reflection, noting that “many twentieth-century structures are seen as performing poorly with regards to energy efficiency. In the current climate crisis, many structures are being demolished because they are considered to be underperforming and/or too costly to sensitively and appropriately upgrade. Elsewhere the special significance of structures has been eroded through mal adaptation in the name of improving energy efficiency. Greater consideration [is] given to energy reduction than embodied carbon.” North Macedonia similarly observed that “climate changes are mostly impacting the twentieth-century heritage in [the] form of incompatible alterations and interventions for increasing energy efficiency (using Styrofoam on the facades).”

Malaysia highlighted that “depending on active cooling system rather than passive system affected the integrity and authenticity of building appearances - altered openings - either closed / reduced size,” while the Philippines noted that “the generally warming climate also means that the eloquence of tropical architectural response of 20th century heritage is muted or muffled by increased dependence on air conditioning.” The United Kingdom reported a significant loss of original historic fabric, particularly glazed façades and exterior walls, due to the increasing pressure to overclad. Mitigation measures—such as adding insulation or installing new heating systems—are being implemented across domestic, commercial, and public buildings, but they come with high costs when carried out to a high standard.

Venezuela explained that “the rise in temperature and pests has created the need for temperature control within buildings. As a result, many declared or catalogued buildings are being modified to install artificial ventilation, eliminating original enclosures and cross-ventilation systems.”

Other responses stressed that climate change is intensifying pre-existing weaknesses in maintenance, planning, and governance. Bosnia-Herzegovina emphasized that

neglect and inappropriate resident interventions exacerbate vulnerabilities, noting that “due to inadequate maintenance, some materials deteriorate faster; residents make inappropriate interventions.” Costa Rica pointed to deficiencies in territorial planning and neglect of high-risk coastal areas, while France warned that climate change is “exacerbating the lack of routine maintenance.”

The following question was addressed to respondents who indicated that climate change is negatively affecting twentieth-century heritage. They were asked to identify what climate change adaptation measures have been implemented in their countries to address these impacts (see Figure 7.3).

Responses revealed a wide range of interpretations of the question. Some responses focused specifically on adaptation and mitigation measures applied to twentieth-century heritage, while others described actions relating to heritage of all periods, and still others referred more broadly to general climate change policies or sustainability initiatives without an explicit heritage focus. This diversity of perspectives reflects the reality that twentieth-century heritage is often not addressed as a distinct category within national or local strategies.

Notably, none of the responses referred to dedicated strategies, studies, or action plans focused specifically on twentieth-century heritage, highlighting a significant gap in this area of conservation practice.

If so, what sort of climate change adaptations measures are taken regarding Twentieth-century heritage places in your country?




Figure 7.3: Analysis of the open-ended question about climate change adaptation measures. Responses were analyzed using keywords. The number of responses associated with each keyword is shown at the end of each bar

A total of 11 responses reported that their countries took *little or no action* on climate adaptation measures targeting twentieth-century heritage (Argentina, Brazil, Italy,

Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Norway, Poland, Colombia, Morocco, Uruguay, and Venezuela). Brazil stated that “so far, we cannot highlight any specific policy concerning climate changes and preservation of cultural heritage.” Cyprus similarly noted that “there is no record of any large-scale climate change adaptation measures currently being implemented,” while the Dominican Republic reported that “there is no governmental prevention and maintenance program for 20th-century buildings.”

Ten responses warned that *insensitive energy efficiency measures and building envelope interventions* are often implemented in ways that negatively affect heritage values and integrity. Bosnia and Herzegovina observed that “by warming the elevations and changing the openings, buildings lose their authentic appearance or are degraded completely,” while Bulgaria noted that “thermal insulation and window replacement usually leads to loss of original details and identity.” Croatia noted that “insulation on modernist buildings is not always performed in accordance with the original design,” and the Czech Republic reported that “insulation and new infrastructure are frequently prioritized over architectural values.”

Similar concerns were raised by Germany, which reported that façade insulation and window replacement alter building appearances, while Hungary noted that such processes “do not take into account the preservation of the values of this heritage.” Ireland highlighted “inappropriate adaptation with external wall insulation and replacement of historic fenestration; even demolition in some cases.” North Macedonia reported that “unfortunately, many significant buildings from this period were subject to the forceful alteration of their facades with inappropriate materials that led to the loss of their authenticity and integrity,” while the United States of America warned that “poorly designed alterations to all heritage structures in the name of energy efficiency put them at risk of loss of some of their heritage values.”

Nine responses pointed to *national, urban planning, and infrastructure projects*—such as flood defence, landscape management, and infrastructure projects—playing a significant role in climate change mitigation and adaptation, while also benefiting heritage places.

Belgium described a range of integrated approaches underway: “Given Belgium’s vulnerability to flooding, particularly in regions with significant heritage sites, adaptive measures include the reinforcement of riverbanks, better drainage systems, and spatial planning to reduce flood impact on cultural assets. Projects in cities like Bruges and Antwerp integrate these measures with heritage conservation plans. Heat Resilience in Urban Areas: The urban heat island effect is being addressed through increased green spaces and tree planting to cool cities. Adaptive reuse of buildings also helps mitigate heat while preserving the architectural integrity of modernist structures. Adaptive Forest Management: Forested heritage landscapes, such as those surrounding castles and estates, are adapting to climate risks. Measures include

diversifying tree species, improving soil health, and enhancing water retention to cope with drier summers and wetter winters.”

Canada referred to the “creation of more resilient open spaces and infrastructure (permeable/ ‘sponge’ open spaces and infrastructure).” Portugal cited national and regional planning instruments, including “Regional Spatial Planning Programs (PROT – Planos Regionais de Ordenamento do Território), Roadmap for Carbon Neutrality 2050 (Roteiro para a Neutralidade Carbónica 2050), Coastal Zone Programs... and the National Water Plan (Plano Nacional da Água).”

Saudi Arabia mentioned efforts to “decrease carbon footprint by planting more trees,” while Serbia referred to “an attempt to adjust to the EU standards.” Spain cited its “National Climate Change Adaptation Plan (PNACC) 2021–2030, including a section for cultural heritage,” and Thailand emphasized the need for “adaptive reuse designs for disaster, new regulations of building adaptation in flooding zone have to be applied.” The Netherlands response explained that “climate change adaptation is already taking place at various levels in our country, from infrastructure (dykes, waterways) and farm lands to towns and buildings. These adaptations are primarily made for human survival (more than half of our population lives below sea level, but currently the other half is partly suffering from local floods due to the overload of rain and melt water that comes down from the Alps in unprecedented quantities). Other adaptations are being made to reduce energy costs (e.g. placing of solar panels, or insulation glass panes) or to reduce CO2 emissions (installing huge wind turbines).”

Türkiye noted that although national and local climate strategies exist, “there is no specific mention of 20C heritage in any of these plans.”

Nine responses reported on *energy retrofit and sustainability upgrades*, reflecting a strong push to reduce carbon footprints and improve energy performance through physical upgrades to heritage places. The Abu Dhabi respondent noted that system upgrades and retrofitting are underway, including the installation of solar panels and more efficient mechanical and electrical systems. Canada’s response cited “installation of insulation, rehabilitation of roofs and windows, sustainable materials, and obligation to collect rainwater,” while Chile referred to “passive control methods, stricter insulation standards, and energy reduction incentives.” Denmark mentioned “stormwater retention, solar and wind energy integration,” Germany reported integrating renewable energy resources and energy-efficiency measures, and Israel cited “thermal insulation, green roofs, photovoltaic panels (limited use).”

North Macedonia noted “replacements of the roofs and windows of many primary and secondary schools throughout the country. Several green terraces have been installed on the rooftops of buildings in Skopje,” while Singapore reported “insulation and waterproofing replacement of RC roofs, rooftop planting, glazing upgrades.”

Only two responses referred to structured *policy frameworks* that explicitly address both heritage and climate adaptation. Australia cited the NSW Sustainable Heritage Buildings Guide and Victoria’s Heritage and Climate Change program, while Spain again referred to the National Climate Change Adaptation Plan (PNACC) 2021–2030, which includes cultural heritage considerations.

The fourth question in this section asked whether, in the responding country, there is a policy framework or any guidance documents on energy efficiency, sustainability, or climate change that directly address twentieth-century heritage (see Figure 7.4).

The majority of responses (72%) indicated that no such policies or guidance documents exist in their countries. A smaller group (16%) reported that relevant policies or documents exist, while 12% were unsure.




Figure 7.4: Respondents’ indications regarding the existence of policy frameworks or guidance addressing energy efficiency, sustainability, or climate change in relation to twentieth-century heritage. Response numbers appear inside the pie chart.

Respondents who answered positively were invited to cite the documents or policies to which they referred, and the complete list of references is provided in Appendix XII. Responses reveal that the question was interpreted in different ways. Some respondents understood it to refer to documents containing guidance specifically focused on twentieth-century heritage, while others interpreted it more broadly, as general environmental or sustainability policies that may indirectly affect twentieth-century heritage but are not heritage-specific. These differing interpretations contributed to the range of responses received.

Overall, six responses (Australia, Croatia, Israel, the Netherlands, the UK, and the USA) mentioned guidance or national guidelines for the energy renovation of heritage buildings, which may include twentieth-century heritage places. Some responses stated that their national guidance documents on energy efficiency and sustainability

apply to all types of structures and are not specifically tailored to heritage, while two responses (Costa Rica and Estonia) noted that relevant research projects are currently underway. Importantly, no response identified guidance documents that focus specifically on twentieth-century heritage or that include a dedicated section addressing it.

Notably, six responses that selected “No” or “I don’t know” nonetheless provided additional contextual information. They referred to ongoing initiatives in their countries, including general guidelines and studies that, while not explicitly focused on twentieth-century heritage, may nonetheless have implications for it.

The fifth question in this section invited respondents to suggest three ways in which ISC20C could build climate literacy regarding the conservation of twentieth-century heritage (see Figure 7.5).

Please suggest three ways in which ISC20C could build climate literacy regarding conserving Twentieth Century heritage ?




Figure 7.5: Respondents’ suggestions on how ISC20C could build climate literacy in relation to the conservation of twentieth-century heritage. Analysis of the open-ended responses is grouped using keywords. The number of responses for each keyword is shown at the end of each bar.

Responses proposed a wide range of activities and thematic areas for the ISC20C to consider. While not all suggestions relate directly to climate literacy in a narrow sense, they are included here as they reflect broader perceptions of needs and opportunities in this field.

A recurring theme across many responses (23) was the importance of sharing knowledge and publishing accessible resources to guide practitioners, policymakers, and other stakeholders. Responses emphasized the value of sharing international experiences, as well as the creation of glossaries, literature surveys, toolkits, and open-access research outputs. Publications are seen not only as a means of circulating technical expertise, but also as a way to share approaches and foster

climate literacy within the heritage field. Case studies were repeatedly identified as being particularly useful (see also below).

Argentina noted the need to “disseminate documents that make reference to the subject and publish concrete experiences in different countries regarding measures and instruments applied.” India similarly suggested the need to “develop and disseminate literature / publications on the topic.” New Zealand pointed to “sustainability initiatives”, “additional publications,” and “financial incentives.” Portugal proposed “a glossary of terms, a GIS Map for the World Twentieth Century Heritage, reference case studies.” Singapore outlined a structured approach, calling for “A. Compilation and dissemination of glossary (specific to 20C heritage); B. Compilation of literature survey. C. Design of climate change adaptation/ mitigation toolkit and dissemination.” Spain also emphasized digital dissemination through “online courses, open publications, research projects.”

Responses highlighted the need to strengthen skills and capacity at multiple levels, from individual practitioners to national institutions. Suggested initiatives include training, lectures, seminars, webinars, and participatory workshops, often delivered in hybrid formats to maximize reach. Capacity-building efforts were framed as essential to equipping professionals with methodological and technical knowledge—such as whole life cycle analysis—and to embedding climate adaptation considerations in everyday conservation practice.

Brazil proposed “lectures, seminars (in person and online), professional training scholarships,” while Costa Rica recommended conducting “participatory workshops with support and technical guidance from various organizations, including non-governmental entities such as the National Committees of ICOMOS International.” The Dominican Republic suggested “creating a programme for the awareness, dissemination and implementation of actions of conservation and protection against climate change for 20th-century heritage property.” Ireland stressed the need to “upskill architects, planners and conservation officers in whole life cycle analysis – at present the technicalities are little understood and often figures are manipulated at the cost of our Twentieth-century heritage.” Mexico proposed “holding webinars to achieve wider capacity building,” Nigeria called for workshops, hands-on practical training, and a “toolkit on Twentieth heritage on good practice,” and Venezuela suggested developing “a seminar on climate change risk management in Spanish, by region (Caribbean), using criteria similar to those carried out by ICCROM.”

Research emerged as a foundational requirement for effective climate action. Responses called for scientific studies, systematic data collection, and the development of methodological frameworks. Proposed research topics include thermal simulations, life cycle assessments, risk management studies, and investigations into climate impacts on materials and construction techniques.

Research was also linked to the definition of good practices and to collaboration with academic, professional, and governmental stakeholders.

France provided a set of proposals, including “conducting dynamic thermal simulation studies and instrument a selection of representative buildings to better understand them and propose appropriate solutions; carry out comparative life cycle assessments (LCAs) to measure the environmental impact of interventions; establish ICOMOS surveys, coordinated by ISC20C, on maintenance practices for twentieth-century heritage; define good practices, develop methodologies, provide case studies and examples, and promote effective conservation solutions. Foster collaboration and knowledge-sharing on architectural culture, and provide client-side advisory support in partnership with organizations such as the associations of French mayors (for public buildings) and bodies such as the French National Real Estate Federation (FNAIM) (for condominium properties).” Italy suggested to “1) Focus on case studies at risk from climate change impacts in different geographical areas; 2) Investigate how climate change impacts on 20C construction techniques (especially concrete).” Japan emphasized technical upgrades, stating that “we believe it is important to improve the insulation of the 20th century heritage, retrofit the air conditioning, and replace it with double glazing.” The Philippines highlighted the relevance of climate-responsive design traditions, noting that “the response to the tropical climate as a theme of 20th century heritage, and how climate change is affecting this theme, would be a relevant topic here, that could be discussed in conferences, publications, and videos.” Spain suggested “online courses, open publications, research projects,” while Venezuela proposed the development of a “Risk Management Project for a modern heritage building or representative complex from the 20th century in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC).”

Practical case studies and demonstration projects were widely identified as important tools for translating principles and research into practice. Responses emphasized the value of documenting and sharing examples of adaptive reuse projects, sensitive upgrading measures, and region-specific challenges to demonstrate how conservation and climate adaptation can be reconciled. Case studies were also seen as a way to provide tangible evidence of the climate benefits of conservation, particularly in terms of retaining embodied carbon and addressing climate risks across different building types and geographical contexts.

Australia suggested that “adaptive reuse case study examples shared globally responding to climate crisis.” Ireland recommended documenting “case studies where appropriate and sensitive upgrading measures have been employed.” Italy reiterated the need to focus on “case studies at risk from climate change impacts,” while the United Kingdom emphasized “good case studies. Emphasis on retention of embodied carbon versus operational carbon use as electricity supply becomes de-carbonised.”

A few responses underscored the importance of advocacy aimed at improving energy efficiency regulations, to ensure that flexibility, exemptions, or lower requirements can be negotiated for twentieth-century heritage when needed. The objective is to achieve a better balance between sustainability goals and heritage conservation.

Bulgaria called for “advocating at high European level for accepting exceptions to the rules for energy efficiency regulations for Twentieth Century heritage” and for “advocating at local level...for understanding and recognizing Twentieth Century heritage values that do not meet energy efficiency requirements BUT need to be preserved.” Denmark similarly requested “more policies and guidance. A library of national policies, that specifically build up climate literacy for the 20th-century heritage (Including ISC20C explanation on what is important, so that it is easy to read and understand).”

Raising public awareness and engaging communities were identified as important components of building climate literacy and support for twentieth-century heritage conservation. Responses pointed to a range of approaches, from targeted awareness-raising tools to broader media campaigns using storytelling, documentaries, and expert interviews.

The respondent from Algeria referred to “developing awareness-raising tools,” while the Türkiye response suggested that “launching public awareness campaigns using various media platforms, can highlight the importance of the 20C heritage, the threats posed by climate change, and ways to mitigate these risks. Engaging stories, documentaries, and interviews with experts can make the issue more relatable and urgent to a broader audience.”

The responses to this question revealed several recurring themes and topics of interest, as outlined below.

Energy efficiency

Responses emphasized the need for guidance on energy retrofitting and sensitive energy-upgrading measures, with particular attention to the specific vulnerabilities of modern heritage buildings. They called for better policies and examples of nuanced solutions when heritage values conflict with energy performance requirements.

Responses asked for specific guidance on insulating twentieth-century structures, retrofitting air conditioning systems, and replacing or upgrading glazing, with the aim of balancing performance improvements with the preservation of heritage values. Technical recommendations requested also included identifying retrofitting guidelines for mechanical systems. One response highlighted the need for dynamic thermal simulation studies and for using tools to monitor the environments of representative buildings to better understand performance and to propose appropriate, evidence-

based, and climate-specific solutions. Responses also asked for guidance for specific climate contexts, e.g., Mediterranean, arid, northern, and tropical.

Embodied carbon and whole life thinking

An important thread in the survey responses centred on whole life carbon analysis, as there is growing recognition of the value of retaining embodied carbon rather than focusing solely on operational carbon, especially as electricity supplies become progressively decarbonized. Responses underscored the importance of recognizing the embodied energy of existing buildings as an argument for retaining them. They also expressed interest in integrating this thinking into conservation and adaptation strategies using comparative life cycle analyses to measure the environmental impact of interventions and ensure that sustainability decisions are based on robust evidence.

Adaptive reuse case studies—shared globally—were highlighted as key references requested for demonstrating how modern heritage can be sensitively adapted to address the climate crisis while conserving cultural value. This would also prove the climate benefits of conserving and reusing existing materials and structures rather than replacing them.

Climate change adaptation

In tropical regions in particular, responses identified climate-responsive design as a defining characteristic of twentieth-century heritage that warrants focused study. The increasing need for cooling in buildings originally designed for natural ventilation, combined with the impacts of climate change, was seen as a significant threat, underscoring the need for targeted guidance. One response suggested integrating risk management strategies for modern heritage buildings into conservation planning to ensure a systematic and forward-looking approach.

Beyond buildings: cultural landscapes, public spaces, and interiors

Responses stressed that twentieth-century heritage extends beyond individual buildings to include cultural landscapes, public spaces, gardens, and interiors. Proposed actions include advocating for the conservation of public spaces, which are integral components of twentieth-century heritage environments; developing Environmental Sustainability Plans for cultural landscapes and gardens; and sharing examples of water- and energy-saving strategies.

Materials and construction techniques

Finally, responses drew attention to the impacts of climate change on materials and construction techniques characteristic of the twentieth century, highlighting both challenges and opportunities. Responses noted the need to reflect on experimental building methods that now pose conservation challenges, and to pay greater attention to improving maintenance protocols to extend the lifespan of twentieth-century buildings and materials and reduce waste.

Codes and incentives

Adapting building codes to better balance heritage conservation and sustainability objectives was identified as an urgent policy priority. Responses sought examples of regulations that recognize the significance of heritage assets and provide greater flexibility in performance requirements, including exemptions for buildings with high heritage value.

Recognizing the financial constraints affecting many projects, some responses asked for comparative studies on incentives that support conservation, energy retrofitting, and climate adaptation measures.

The sixth survey question in this section was intended to assess how twentieth-century heritage benefits from six key factors (see Figure 7.6). Respondents were asked to rank them from 1 (no benefit) to 5 (very strong benefits).

On a scale 1 to 5, how are the following factors benefitting Twentieth-century heritage conservation in your country?




Figure 7.6: Respondents' ratings of how strongly six key factors benefit twentieth-century heritage conservation in their country, on a scale from 1 (no benefit) to 5 (very strong benefit).

By a wide margin, responses identified *rising popular appreciation and interest* as the most important factor benefitting twentieth-century heritage conservation. This factor was followed by the availability of *more guidance documents and knowledge*, the *increased retention of structures for sustainability reasons*, and the perception that *legal protection for twentieth-century heritage places has become easier to obtain*.

Several responses linked growing appreciation directly to increased advocacy and institutional engagement. In Australia, this was associated with “increasing numbers of advocacy groups; focussed conferences, ICOMOS Working Groups; [and] Blue Shield initiatives regionally in Australia and New Zealand,” reflecting a broader ecosystem of professional and civil society activity. Similarly, Morocco highlighted the role of civil engagement, noting efforts focused on “raising public awareness through civil society organizations.”

In other contexts, responses pointed to longer-term cultural shifts. In Poland, improvements were attributed to “generational changes and greater understanding of the problem of 20th century heritage,” suggesting a gradual normalization of twentieth-century heritage within mainstream heritage discourse. Spain identified more formal institutional recognition through the adoption of a “National Plan for the Conservation of 20th Century Heritage,” indicating how strategic policy frameworks can reinforce public appreciation and professional practice.

While increased appreciation was widely seen as positive, responses also emphasized that it does not automatically translate into effective protection. The United States of America response observed that “as the appreciation grows, there is the potential for better outcomes,” cautioning that “many sites are still at risk,” particularly due to obsolescence affecting corporate campuses and municipal buildings constructed in a Brutalist style.

More than half of the responses rated the *availability of national funding and incentives for twentieth-century heritage* and the *availability of international twentieth-century heritage programmes and funding* as factors having provided little or no benefit to the conservation of twentieth-century heritage.

In the seventh survey question, respondents were asked to look ahead and assess the potential influence of six trends on the conservation of twentieth-century heritage over the coming years, ranking them on a scale from 1 (trend not perceived) to 5 (very strong trend) (see Figure 7.7).




Figure 7.7: Respondents’ assessments of how strongly six key trends are expected to impact twentieth-century heritage places in their country over the next five years, rated on a scale from 1 (trend not perceived) to 5 (very strong trend). The number of responses for each trend rating is shown at the end of each bar.

Overall, four trends were identified as “strong” or “very strong” in the majority of responses. These include *increasing recognition of intangible community and social values of twentieth-century heritage places* (66%); *increasing adaptive reuse and retrofit projects involving twentieth-century heritage places in which climate change is a major driver* (61.8%); *increasing engagement of communities in twentieth-century heritage conservation and management* (59%); and *a broadening of the types of places considered to be significant twentieth-century heritage* (56%).

In contrast, fewer than half of responses considered *increasing recognition and protection of twentieth-century landscapes and urban areas* (49%) and *increasing recognition and protection of the heritage of difficult twentieth-century pasts* (38%) strong or very strong trends.

Several responses expanded on these trends by highlighting country-specific dynamics expected to influence conservation trends over the next five years. Cyprus noted that “one perceived trend which benefits the protection of Twentieth-century heritage places in Cyprus is the increased awareness for the environmental impact of demolitions, as well as the financial benefits of reuse.” In the Dominican Republic, the anticipated influence of governance was emphasized through “the commitment of government authorities to the conservation and protection of 20th century heritage.” Morocco pointed to changing economic actors, observing increasing “private-sector involvement in the transformation of 20th-century heritage,” while the response from Nepal underlined historical reconciliation, stating that a key trend is “accepting recent history, often linked to foreign influence, as important local and national history.” In Poland, economic mechanisms were foregrounded through “tax and economic incentives,” and Spain highlighted social dynamics through “growing social participation, associationism and volunteering.”

The eighth survey question was optional. It invited respondents to elaborate further on the challenges and opportunities related to the conservation of twentieth-century heritage. Fewer than half of the responses provided additional comments, but those responses reveal a set of recurring, widely shared concerns.

A dominant challenge across regions was inadequate legal protection or weak implementation of existing frameworks. In a few countries, twentieth-century heritage remains excluded from legislation altogether; more commonly, it is insufficiently listed or inconsistently protected at national and local levels. This situation leaves many sites vulnerable to demolition, speculative development, or unsympathetic alteration. Responses also pointed to structural weaknesses in national heritage systems, which offer limited protection even when places are listed, and to issues related to underfunded institutions, limited technical expertise, and inadequate management structures, all of which undermine the effective enforcement of existing heritage protection laws. As the response from North Macedonia observed, “cultural heritage

cannot survive only being protected on paper, but real protection and plans for its sustainable development is needed.”

Energy efficiency and climate policy emerged as another major area of concern. Responses repeatedly stressed that retrofitting requirements under regional and national directives pose serious risks when applied indiscriminately to modern heritage buildings. In several contexts, demolition is still favored over renovation or reuse, despite the high levels of embodied carbon of many twentieth-century structures. This trend raises an alarm about the loss of cultural value and the waste of embodied carbon. The response from Australia argued that “restricting the demolition of buildings with high embodied carbon needs to become more central in heritage practice and discourse.”

At the same time, responses emphasized persistent knowledge gaps that hinder the integration of sustainability principles into conservation practice and/or vice versa. Cultural and political barriers further complicate this challenge: public underappreciation of post-war architecture, lack of political support, and negative perceptions of “difficult” or dissonant heritage were cited as significant obstacles.

Climate change impacts were again identified as an increasing threat, affecting the heritage of all periods. Rising temperatures, altered weather patterns, flooding, and water scarcity place additional pressure on twentieth-century materials and construction systems, making adaptation and proactive risk management increasingly urgent.

Responses also identified a range of significant opportunities for twentieth-century heritage. Many responses highlighted the potential to align conservation more closely with sustainability agendas by reducing consumption through appropriate energy retrofits, retaining embodied carbon through reuse, and integrating heritage considerations into broader urban and environmental planning frameworks.

There was also clear evidence of growing public appreciation and interest in modern heritage—particularly Pre-War Modernism—often driven by NGOs, charities, and independent experts. These initiatives are helping to build momentum and foster dialogue with heritage administrations, which are frequently slower to adapt.

Responses also pointed to opportunities for broader application of value-based approaches, including the use of thematic frameworks to guide the identification of heritage places in surveys. Education, training, and community engagement were repeatedly cited as essential tools for strengthening recognition of the cultural value of twentieth-century heritage.

International and regional cooperation was identified as another key opportunity to promote recognition of Modernism as a shared phenomenon; several responses also

emphasized that inscription of twentieth-century sites on the World Heritage List can provide increased visibility, public appreciation, and access to political and financial incentives that support more robust conservation outcomes. Venezuela observed that “having Modern Heritage represented on the World Heritage List is an important incentive to advance its conservation and management.”

Finally, responses called for expanded research into experimental materials, decay mechanisms, and conservation methodologies. They also stressed the need to strengthen the policy and financial frameworks underpinning conservation practice. Suggested actions include improving tax incentives, expanding social awareness programs, and securing greater heritage support funding—particularly for privately owned buildings, which were consistently identified as among the most vulnerable components of twentieth-century heritage. As the response from Tunisia noted, current threats include “insufficient protection tools... unjustified destruction of quality buildings, disfiguring the urban environment, [and] demolitions caused by property speculation and lack of maintenance.”

The final question in this section of the survey asked respondents to identify what types of information, guidance, or documents related to the conservation and management of twentieth-century heritage would be most helpful in their countries (see Figure 7.8).

What sort of information, guidance or documents relating the conservation and management of Twentieth-century heritage would be useful in your country?




Figure 7.8: Information identified by respondents as most useful for twentieth-century heritage conservation. The open-ended responses were analyzed using keywords. The number of responses associated with each keyword is shown at the end of each bar.

Overall, responses emphasized the need for easy access to practical, technically grounded, and context-sensitive resources, especially regarding the conservation of modern materials and technical aspects of twentieth-century heritage. Many responses highlighted the lack of targeted guidance addressing materials such as reinforced concrete, glass façades, tiles, asbestos, metal and stone cladding, curtain walls, and plastic façade components.

The Czech Republic response explicitly asked for guidance on “how to deal with glass facades, exposed concrete facades, ceramic tiles, or other kinds of cladding, and how to get rid of asbestos efficiently without impact on authentic structures.” Similar concerns were echoed in India, which called for “technical information on conserving and maintaining modern materials and experimental constructions.” Italy requested “guidance for professional conservators and workmanship on practical implementation of conservation works on modern materials, especially concrete.” Responses from Lithuania and New Zealand emphasized the need for easily accessible and practical resources, requesting “short videos on how to preserve, conserve, and repair different modern materials” and “information that explains the characteristics and qualities of material used for 20th C buildings, and guidance on repair rather than replacement as a first intention.” Singapore similarly stressed the value of “technical design case studies on conservation and repairs to 20th C building materials such as concrete, ceramic tiled facades, metal and stone cladding, curtain walls, plastic façade components, etc.”

Closely related to this need for technical guidance was a strong call for case studies and good examples of twentieth-century heritage conservation projects. Responses repeatedly cited case studies as persuasive tools that demonstrate feasibility and value in real-world contexts. In the Philippines, the advocacy value of such resources was stressed, noting that “best practice examples from other countries would be useful here, at the very least to help convince property owners and decision makers of the viability of conserving 20th century heritage.” The response from India asked for “success stories of conserving 20C, especially in Asia,” while Ireland emphasized the importance of “dissemination of case study projects that demonstrate the range of positive social, environmental, cultural and financial benefits relating to the conservation and management of 20th century heritage for all.” Lithuania reiterated the usefulness of applied examples through “short videos on successful case studies of conservation of modern heritage, and how theoretical knowledge was applied in practice in real case studies.”

Another frequently cited need concerned guidance and case studies focused on building regulation upgrades, code compliance, and adaptive reuse. Responses highlighted the challenges of reconciling contemporary regulatory requirements with the conservation of twentieth-century heritage. Australia, for example, requested “advice regarding Building Code C20 adaptation e.g., re Fire Access and services utilities to engage with heritage requirements.” Iceland called more broadly for

guidance “regarding changes/alteration and reuse of buildings and building materials,” while Singapore emphasized the need for “case studies on code compliance upgrades to 20C heritage buildings, e.g., structural strengthening, MEP/vertical circulation system upgrades, façade upgrades.”

Advice on balancing the need for energy efficiency and sustainability improvements repeatedly emerged as a priority area. Responses emphasized both the urgency of improving environmental performance and the risks posed by poorly designed retrofits. Denmark articulated a comprehensive need for guidance, stating: “We need guidance documents on best practice when it comes to energy retrofit. Increased focus on sustainability aspects in 20th-century heritage: A catalogue illustrating in which ways 20th-century heritage aligns with the 17 Sustainable Development Goals, specifically targeted at investors, developers, and consultants. A practical and manageable guide could serve as a support tool for integrating sustainable practices and heritage management while promoting the conservation of 20th-century heritage.” Ireland similarly called for “guidance on sympathetic upgrades to improve energy efficiency,” while Singapore emphasized the importance of scale- and typology-specific resources, requesting “technical design case studies on retrofitting large scale modernist buildings of various typologies, such as towers, large span structures like stadia, schools, etc. Climate adaptation/mitigation case studies; Carbon calculator for 20C heritage buildings especially large scale, high rise, high density typologies.” The United Kingdom likewise highlighted the value of “case studies including sensitive environmental retrofit.”

Argentina requested “guidelines for intervention in different types of 20th century properties, especially in the face of risks such as the impacts of climate change,” while Australia emphasized the importance of evidence-based approaches through “case studies of proactive impact assessment and management of climate impacts on C20 places.” India called for guidance “on issues of sustainability and climate literacy with respect to conserving 20C Heritage,” and Israel noted the need for “guidance regarding climate adaptation.” Responses from North Macedonia and Singapore reinforced this point, respectively calling for “all sorts of guidance and documents regarding conservation, legislatives, management and sustainable development of the Twentieth-century heritage buildings and places” and for “climate adaptation/mitigation case studies.”

Other responses underlined the foundational importance of identification, inventories, and documentation. Canada stated: “We could use guidelines to support inventories in a way that data would be collected and compatible on an international level, to increase the visibility of modern heritage.” China similarly called to “further deepen the regulations, standards, guidelines for the identification, classification, assessment, protection management and utilization of the cultural heritage of modern and contemporary types.”

Economic and financial aspects were also identified as an area where guidance would be beneficial, though relatively fewer responses mentioned them. Morocco requested “best practices in financial aid and tax incentives,” while Singapore asked for “case studies on legislation, planning and financial incentives and how these are applied to 20C sites and places.”

Two responses highlighted the need for examples of conservation management plans. Portugal, for instance, requested “more reference cases and good practices of Conservation Management Plans.”

Finally, the Australian response raised social values as a specific topic of interest, emphasizing the importance of continued reflection and debate and calling for “ongoing discourse about identifying and retaining C20 social values in adaptation projects.”

Across several of these responses, the importance of local contextualization emerged clearly. Brazil, Norway, and Venezuela all emphasized that guidance and research must be tailored or easily adaptable to national and local realities. As the response from Brazil noted, “any research and work carried out on 20th-century heritage can be helpful as long as the local-Brazilian context is taken into account.” This recurring emphasis highlights the challenge of producing international guidance that remains sufficiently flexible and relevant to respond to diverse climatic, cultural, regulatory, and socio-economic contexts.

Responses proposed not only priority content areas but also specific formats and methods for disseminating existing resources related to the conservation and management of twentieth-century heritage (see Figure 7.9).

What sort of information, guidance or documents relating the conservation and management of Twentieth-century heritage would be useful in your country? Focus on the types of activities / formats suggested by the respondents




Figure 7.9: Type of guidance identified by respondents as most helpful for the conservation and management of twentieth-century heritage in their countries. The open-ended responses were analyzed using keywords. The number of responses associated with each keyword is shown at the end of each bar.

A recurrent theme in the responses was the need for guidelines and policy frameworks to guide the conservation of twentieth-century heritage places. As the response from Belgium observed, “a combination of policy frameworks, technical guidelines, research, and community involvement is key for a good approach towards the conservation of Twentieth-century heritage in any country.”

Alongside the need for guidance, responses stressed the growing importance of digital tools and new communication formats to improve accessibility and outreach. Online delivery methods were frequently mentioned as effective ways to disseminate knowledge more broadly and inclusively. Suggestions ranged from “online information sessions” (Cyprus) to strengthening the “community outreach and digital presence of conservation and preservation bodies/initiatives” (Israel). The use of short, targeted video content was also highlighted, with Lithuania proposing “short videos on: 1) how to preserve, conserve, and repair different modern materials, 2) successful case studies of conservation of modern heritage, [and] 3) how theoretical knowledge was applied in practice in real case studies.”

Responses also underlined the importance of more actively disseminating key international reference documents, particularly the *Madrid–New Delhi Document* (MNDD) and the *Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework* (TCHTF). Several noted that their impact depends on broader awareness and integration into local and national practice, which were seen as essential.

The response from South Africa called for “widespread dissemination of the MND document, promoting engagement with heritage authorities and practitioners on the significance of 20thC heritage.” The response from the United States of America emphasized the need for these documents to reach decision-makers at all levels, noting that “they need to percolate all the way DOWN to local municipalities and also UP to the National Park Service and State Historic Preservation Offices who are the ones often making determinations of what gets saved and preserved, and how it is done” Similarly, Uruguay highlighted the importance of “systematic dissemination of documents cited in this survey.”

The value of international exchange of information also emerged strongly. Responses saw international sharing of experiences and good practices as essential for capacity building and advocacy. As Denmark suggested, there is a need for “establishing global foundations to promote greater international exchange of knowledge and awareness of 20th-century heritage,” while the responses from Nepal and the Philippines emphasized the usefulness of “examples to show from other countries” and “best practice examples from other countries” to help convince property owners and decision-makers of the viability of conservation.

Croatia requested access to publications and bibliographies to support professional practice. The response from Venezuela provided additional context to such requests: “Ensuring that specialist officials have access to recent international bibliographies and documentation in Spanish would be a significant step forward. [...] adapting information to new phone technologies to be accessible in various formats is crucial. Detailed examples of interventions in modern heritage presented in user-friendly digital formats would be a significant advancement.”

Two responses suggested translating key documents into Thai and Turkish, respectively, underscoring language as an important factor in effective dissemination.

As in previous sections of the survey, responses identified the importance of capacity building through training, particularly in accessible, practice-oriented formats such as online sessions and local workshops, reinforcing the broader call for knowledge to be not only available but also usable in real-world contexts.

7.3 Key Findings

Responses described a wide range of challenges and opportunities currently affecting the conservation of twentieth-century heritage. The most pressing threats identified in responses were urban development pressures, insufficient financial resources and incentives, and incompatible alterations, many of which are increasingly driven by climate change mitigation requirements, particularly energy-efficiency upgrades.

Despite these challenges, responses also pointed to significant opportunities. Growing public appreciation and generational shifts in perception were widely noted, alongside a rising recognition of the relationship between heritage conservation, sustainability initiatives, and embodied carbon considerations. Together, these trends are strengthening the case for conservation over demolition. Adaptive reuse projects are becoming more common, and the sharing of international experience is increasingly rapid and highly valued.

Looking ahead, responses emphasized the importance of advancing research on modern materials, developing technical guidance on retrofitting and adaptation, and disseminating case studies that can inspire and convince decision-makers. Although the ISC20C has been closely involved in the research, collaborative development, and publication of *The Cádiz Document: InnovaConcrete Guidelines for the Conservation of Concrete Heritage*, it does not appear to be well known and was not mentioned in responses.

Training initiatives, awareness campaigns, and community engagement were consistently identified as important actions for securing broad-based support for the conservation of twentieth-century heritage.

Overall, the survey highlights a clear paradox: while twentieth-century heritage is gaining recognition and appreciation, it remains at significant risk. This vulnerability is linked to the relatively poor identification of significant places, insufficient legal protection, lack of political will, underfunded or diminishing conservation resources and administrative systems, limited incentives, and the growing risk of incompatible alterations—particularly those resulting from maladaptive approaches to energy efficiency.

This final section of the survey placed particular emphasis on investigating how climate change is affecting twentieth-century heritage. While mitigation, adaptation, and resilience strategies extend well beyond the heritage sector, responses stressed that twentieth-century heritage presents specific vulnerabilities that warrant dedicated attention. Although the impacts of climate change on C20 heritage have not yet been fully assessed, responses reported material deterioration and heightened exposure to risks associated with construction techniques and location. They repeatedly highlighted that energy-efficiency requirements are driving inappropriate alterations that compromise authenticity and significance.

Only a small number of countries have begun to integrate cultural heritage into broader climate adaptation and sustainability frameworks, and no responses reported strategies specifically designed for twentieth-century heritage. To address these gaps, responses expressed a strong interest in accessing resources on energy efficiency, embodied carbon research, and whole-life thinking, particularly when applied to relevant, well-documented case studies of twentieth-century places.

Targeted literature examining the role of twentieth-century heritage in climate mitigation, as well as guidance on adapting such heritage to the impacts of climate change, were seen as especially valuable. Responses also emphasized the need for practical tools tailored to the unique vulnerabilities of twentieth-century places and for clearer guidance on integrating heritage considerations more effectively into climate policy.

In this context, responses suggested that the ISC20C could play an important role by supporting the dissemination of knowledge and publications; offering training, workshops, and capacity-building opportunities; engaging in technical research and data collection; promoting case studies and demonstration projects; and advocating for improved policies and guidance. Given that related initiatives are already underway through the ICOMOS Climate Action Working Group, collaboration is an obvious priority.

Beyond climate change, responses repeatedly underscored the need for specific technical resources, real-world case studies, and practical guidance on reuse, adaptation, energy efficiency, and code compliance—including structural and fire code compliance—to demonstrate that conserving modern heritage can be both feasible and sustainable.

Responses noted the importance of extending the focus beyond individual buildings to include twentieth-century cultural landscapes, designed landscapes, public spaces, and interiors, reflecting a broader and more holistic understanding of twentieth-century heritage.

Finally, the survey highlighted clear opportunities for future engagement in regions where interest and participation are high—particularly the Arab States, Africa, and Asia and the Pacific—through collaboration with international members and National Committees, while continuing to support ongoing activities in Europe and the Americas.

8. Conclusions

In conclusion, the survey responses confirm that twentieth-century heritage has now secured a place within contemporary heritage action and discourse, including at a world heritage level. However, persistent gaps remain between research and effective conservation; between specialists' recognition and protection; and between implementing principles and practical realities.

Key recommendations emerging from the survey include:

1. Promote and share knowledge about and good practice for twentieth-century heritage conservation, especially guidance, methodologies, and case studies relating to documentation, identification, protection, conservation and management.
2. Promote the understanding, awareness, and use of the *Madrid-New Delhi Document* (MNDD) through targeted dissemination. Initiate the ten-year review of MNDD.
3. Promote the awareness, use, and adaptation of the *Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework* (TCHTF) through targeted dissemination, training, guidance, case studies, and locally adapted resources.
4. Advance climate change and sustainability initiatives for twentieth-century heritage.
5. Strengthen ISC20C's international advocacy for vulnerable twentieth-century places.
6. Support and advise on issues arising for the world heritage of the twentieth century.
7. Strengthen ISC20C partnerships and collaborations.
8. Respond to regional gaps in ISC20C membership.

The results of this survey provide a strong foundation for ISC20C to shape its future activities and collaborations as the committee enters its third decade and prepares its next Triennial Work Plan 2027-30.

The opportunities for action identified in this report will all strengthen conservation practice and the sustainable management of twentieth-century heritage globally. As the International Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage (ISC20C) of ICOMOS, we are committed to integrating such actions into our programme of work and to advancing them through our activities. However, their successful

implementation cannot rest with a single committee or organisation. We hope this report will inspire heritage professionals, site managers, researchers, policymakers, educational institutions, communities, ICOMOS National Committees, and allied organisations to champion and contribute to these priorities within their own spheres of influence and regions.

The conservation of twentieth-century heritage is a collective responsibility, and meaningful progress will depend on sustained collaboration, the exchange of knowledge and experience, and coordinated action across disciplines, sectors, and regions. By working together, we can ensure that the heritage of the twentieth century is recognised, protected, and valued for generations to come.

Appendices

Appendix I: MAP20 Project Summary 2005

Report on ICOMOS Action Plan on 20th century Heritage (MAP20)

The MAP20 Survey- data illustrates general problems, which had been raised by ICOMOS regarding the scope of existing modern structures, correspondence to the national heritage legislation, registration itself (including recognition, identification, selection, listing with the following protection obligations, monitoring and control) that are generally consonant to the international preservation tendencies.

The MAP20 database documents not only the status quo of the 20th century properties, but also its level of protection, contextual condition and the information on ownership or stewardship. To sum up, the database forms part of an on-going process of documentation and evaluation of 20th century heritage. The aim of the Survey Questionnaire for each country has been the selection of a limited number of 20th century properties which are representative of 20th century heritage.

The MAP20 Survey is an attempt to collect data on 20th century Heritage' phenomenon through the local and national Registers compiled by ICOMOS member groups. Drawing on examples from almost fifty ICOMOS national committees the database shows over six hundred works that belong to 20th century heritage. Despite its wide scope, the database is by no means comprehensive, nor as yet, definitive. It covers regions which have an active ICOMOS membership. Consequently, there are obvious gaps. These include the whole of Africa, Arab States, Asia as well as some countries in Central and South America.

The MAP20 Survey' data indicates the widespread nature of 20th century heritage and supports the often-stated argument that 20th century heritage should be viewed within a broader social, economic and cultural framework. The MAP20 Survey and its database also has another purpose: to re-affirm some of the reasons for the general interest and understanding that has grown up over the past decades, in the 20th century heritage' recognition and protection.

The MAP20 database promises to be a valuable source for documentation of 20th century heritage. Although MAP20 Database is still being refined and updated, the format has been set up and will be posted on ICOMOS web-site to enable access to preservation professionals interested in the subject of preserving the recent past.

The MAP20 Database will be used for two primary purposes:

- first, the database will provide a central location and unified format for cataloguing information about 20th century heritage gathered by ICOMOS national committees
- second, all of the information in the database will be available as a resource for ICOMOS members and preservation professionals who may need specific information about twentieth-century heritage

It is conceivable that in the future the database would be also used to manage information for ICOMOS publication on 20th century Heritage.

There is an urgent need to increase regional representation and thematic balance of the 20th century heritage on the WH List. MAP20 survey' results show under-representation of modern heritage in the context of Asia and Africa.

While the concept of 20th century heritage has been a matter of great discussion, in the survey data particularly in relation to **Africa and Asia**, there appears to be no clear cut and agreed criteria of what constitutes a modern heritage apart from the colonial heritage. For example, concept of “hybrid” appears as one of the essential aspects of the Asian modern heritage.

More so, the issue as to whether African vernacular architecture can qualify as modern heritage is still inconclusive. The subject of modern heritage is still new to the continent of **Africa** and it is clear that modern heritage is comprised of western as well as vernacular architecture; however not all western or vernacular heritage can be classified as modern. There is a need to develop an inclusive and pragmatic definition of what constitutes modern heritage with clear criteria but one that takes into account the unique and diversified characteristics of heritage of humanity from all parts of the world.

The fact is that this heritage is considered to be particularly vulnerable because of weak legal protection and low appreciation among the general public. Most of the countries responded that there are no specific criteria regarding the listing of the 20th c. heritage properties. The methodology that has been adopted for the identification of the 20th century heritage is “significance” based, that includes either or both: historical, architectural, technological, cultural-social and national significance. Problems often occur when artistic value is major principle of selection for listing – other principles such as context value ,associative value and conceptual value should be included as well.

For example - context value refers to preservation of urban spaces i.e. the urban culture of the city. As the twentieth century was above all a century of the common, it is important to bear in mind that not everything can be preserved: selection is crucial. Today, we are aware that the idea, the concept, is more important than physical form (e.g. the preeminence of planning and the dedication to a social program as being true

characteristic of the 20th century; the link between tangible and intangible heritage, particularly memory of the past) and should be incorporated into concept of modern heritage. Quoting from NARA STATEMENT (1994): „significance may lie in the intangible or symbolic, and in preservation of the craftsman’s skills rather than of the fabric itself“.

Some of the case studies in the Survey evidence that the concept of the 20th century Heritage has been expanded from the exclusive concept of the material culture to the intangible aspects of heritage including industrial heritage, education, cultural landscape, planning, and community life. For example, 20th century heritage in India represents a vital link with the ideas, aspirations, and innovations that created a modern democracy. Thus the process of the recognition of the 20th century properties as a heritage identifies consequently 20th century heritage through new thematic approaches, such as the modes of occupation of land and space, industrial technology, urban ensembles, vernacular and reused buildings, environment and cultural landscape. Consequently, the selection of the 20th century heritage properties refers to diverse types of cultural goods, but more important, to their significance to the community such as the case in Australia, Canada, and Finland.

General constraint exists with regard to the definitions as stated in WH Convention (Article 1) and its Operational Guidelines. These properties seldom qualify strictly as “group of buildings” and “sites” and therefore pose problems with regard to Identification and Justification. One particular aspect of the modern era and modern concepts of town planning, is an increasingly diffuse notion of urbanity versus rurality, of core and periphery and a redefinition of the relation with nature. The definitions in the Operational Guidelines and the scope of their application should be broadened since the preeminence of planning and the dedication to a social program is being a true characteristic of the twentieth century architecture.

Furthermore, most of the countries participants do not define specific criteria for the identification/recognition of the 20th century Heritage, nor legal or regulatory constraint for its listing and protection. Properties from the 20th century constitute a very small percentage of statutorily protected buildings and it is only a small number of countries in which proactive programs of identification and protection have been initiated.

In most of the countries that participated in this Survey, the statutory listing programmes for 20th century heritage are still in the formative stages. Opposition to listing is usually based on the assumption that listing freezes buildings. Our argument is raised not to oppose changes but to direct and plan them in dialogue with all the participants in such a way as to bring about positive effects for the people, heritage and environment in general. Listing clearly creates a presumption in favor of building's preservation, but it does not necessarily mean that a building must be preserved whatever the cost; its main purpose is to ensure that the care it taken over decisions concerning its future.

The conservation of 20th century buildings is indeed about the “management of change” since the intention and performance of 20th century buildings altered, the latter being built for a short time span. Therefore performance is a reasonable criterion for listing or not listing –because is about the past. Viability is not a reasonable criterion, because it is about the future. Viability becomes of the essence when we have to deal with the practical future of buildings.

Finally, there is a lack of general appreciation of post –WWII 20th century places. There are exceptions to the latter: the process of the identification and protection of post WWII heritage has been well recognized in North America, Canada, Australia and some EU countries such as Finland, UK.

Aims and goals:

We all know, when resource is valued by a significant portion of the population, its long-term survival and sympathetic treatment is more likely than if no value is ascribed. Therefore, one of the major issues is how to involve (and with what mechanisms- civic voluntarism?) local communities in the establishment of the Tentative List thus making World Heritage process into a more interactive one. This proposal is directed towards each ICOMOS national committee to involve and propose this initiative within their own national preservation network.

- Collaboration with mAAN (Modern Asian Architecture Network) for Asia-Pacific region educating and promoting among members and the general public an appreciation of historic buildings and sites of recent past, particularly those of the last fifty years
- Utilizing case studies, educational papers and presentations, and planning models, encouraging and providing guidance for the evaluation and preservation of recent historic places
- Providing a website with reference materials and a newsletter to assist preservationists and the public
- Organizing and conducting formal training seminars and conferences methods of developing, evaluation and planning that include consideration of resources of historic buildings and sites of recent past

Conclusion:

The MAP20 Survey database demonstrates how documentation is necessarily the prerequisite for any effective action to safeguard. This is no small matter when the objective is to create a methodology for safeguarding the 20th century heritage. The vexed issue of *criteria* is central and therefore we hope that this database will serve as scientific and methodological basis for discussions held by ICOMOS about criteria for inclusion of twentieth century buildings within UNESCOs World Heritage List.

1- Survey Data received from ICOMOS National Committees until March 2005:
Australia, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brasil, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba,
Croatia, Chile, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Denmark, Estonia,
Finland, France, Guinee, Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kenya,
Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, Peru,
Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain,
Sweden, Thailand, Tanzania, Turkey, U.K, U.S.A.

Report and database compiled by

Sandra Uskokovich

ICOMOS Action Plan on 20th century Heritage/ Principal Researcher ICOMOS
CROATIA

University Of Dubrovnik Research Fellow

Restoration and Arts department

MAP20 SUMMARY – DATA 2005

Country	Recognition	Type of Recognition	Time/legal constraints	Conservation issues	'Youngest feature'
Argentina	No*	Dwellings, technical design, churches, new cities.	No		SEPPRA bank, 1966
Australia	No*	Streetscape, beaches, botanical gardens, urban places, public buildings, native/vernacular aboriginal sites, environmental arch.	No	<i>Burra Charter</i> guides conservation practice	Sculpture garden in NGA, 1982
Bolivia	No*	Urban complexes, palaces, universities, industrial arch.	50 years age limit		Univ.La Paz, 1948
Belgium	No*	Growing interest in recent typologies (industrial heritage and funerary heritage)	No		Palais des Congres and cybernetic tower of Liege, 1961
Brasil	No*	Historic, archeological or ethnographic significance	No		Parque do Flamengo, Rio de Janeiro, 1965
Bulgaria	No*	Cultural and historical value	50 years minimum age		Sofia University of St. Kliment Ohridski, 1970s
Cuba	No*	Relevant social and political events related to buildings	No		Belen School and the Housing Unit 1 of East Havana, 1961
Czech Republic	No*	Urban ensembles, new towns reconstructions, industrial arch., technical and vernacular design.	No	Preservation maintained to the level of authenticity, adaptation	Radio Free Europe, 1996
Cyprus	No*	Residences, schools, industrial arch.	No		
Finland	No*	Cottages, housing districts, suburbs, shopping center, banks, tourism and transport buildings, hospitals, roads, schools, cinemas, churches, industrial arch.	No	<i>Land Use Building Act</i> forms a basis of building conservation	Finlandia Hall, 1971-1975
France	Yes ¹	City hall, sports buildings, city parks, residential arch., industrial and educational architecture.	50 years age limit	Restoration trend in 1970s and 1980s	Grand Stade de France, 1997
Hungary	No*		No		Roman Catholic Church, Paks, 1990
Indonesia	No*	City plan, gardens, hotels, villas, streets, districts.	50 years age limit		
Italy	No*	Cultural and Landscape Heritage	No	Possibilities for conservation of contemporary architecture	Auditorium Niccolò Paganini, 1997-2001, Parma, Renzo Piano
Jamaica	No*		No		Institute of Jamaica,

					Kingston, 1970s
Japan	No*	Intangible and natural heritage	No	Special legal protection system – “toroku”	1952
Kenya	No*	Cultural landscapes, intangible heritage, symbolic significance	50 years minimum age	Colonial heritage	Mbaruku Mosque, Mombasa, 1994
Lithuania	No*	Public and sacred objects, engineering and transport structures	50 years minimum age		Scientists centre, Vilnius, 1959
Luxembourg	No*	Residential, industrial, commercial and transportation arch.	No		
Malta	No*	Natural, cultural, urban and areas of high landscape value	No	Urban conservation areas	Neogothic dwelling, St.Paul’s square, Mdina, 1905
Mexico	No*		No		Luis Barragan House (UNESCO)
Netherlands	Yes ¹	Commercial architecture, new towns, industrial arch., housing, engineering works, public buildings, churches.	50 years age limit		Groothandelsg ebouw, Rotterdam, 1953
New Zealand	No*	Traditional and spiritual significance (social, cultural, historical values)	30 years minimum age	Little 20 th C. Maori heritage is formally listed	The Mews, Wellington, 1974
Norway	No*	Technical and industrial heritage, monuments related to the life and work of women	No	Protection is the strongest judicial level of preservation for building	Vila Busk, Bamble, Telemark county, 1987- 90
Panama	No*	Historical significance	No		Palace of Justice, Justo Arosmena, 1965
Philippines	No*	Significance related with historic event	50 minimum age		Villalon house, Cebu City, 1955
Poland	No*	Department store, dwelling colony, new cities, sports hall.	No		Katovice, 1960-71
Portugal	No*	Cultural or civilization values	No	Registration of 20 th century properties recently started	Ocean Swimming Pool in Leca de Palmeira, Matosinhos, 1966
Peru	No*	Historic, technological and aesthetic significance	No		Church of St.Anthony of Padua, 1968, Lima
Russia	No*	Artistic, social and memorial values; engineering and urban design	40 years minimum age	Low grades of legal protection for recent heritage	Department store “Detsky Mir”, Moscow, 1957

Serbia	No*	Cultural significance	No		National Library, Belgrade, 1973
Slovenia	No*	Libraries, villas,skyscrapers.	No		Trg Republike, Ljubljana
Slovakia	No*	Vernacular and industrial heritage	No		The New Bridge, Bratislava, 1973
South Africa	No*	Intangible heritage and material culture	50 years minimum age	Major themes relate to contemporary history	Robben Island, Table Bay, Western Cape, 1960s
Spain	No*	Cultural significance	No	Heritage property listings are required to be included in urban planning documents	Restoration Center, University of Madrid, 1990s
Suisse	No*	All types/styles ¹	No		Cube,J.Nouvel .
Tanzania	No*		100 years minimum age	Conservation areas - only worth of conserving	Mzizima historic garden quarter, Dar es Salaam City
Turkey	No*	Apartment buildings, residences, mosque, industrial arch.	No	Restoration with a new function/adaptation	Mosque Turkish Assembly, 1987
UK	No*	Social housing schemes, industrial arch., cathedrals, world heritage sites.	30 years age limit	Differing practices in three home countries	Express Lift Tower, 1980-82
USA	No*	Artistic, social, historical and cultural values	50 years age limit		Charles W. Jenkins House, Penobscot, Maine, 1989
Venezuela	No*	Urban complexes, schools, airports, tourist buildings.	50 years age limit		C.C.La Vega, 1956-8
Zambia	No*	Residences, industrial buildings, vernacular arch.	No		Residence of president, 1946

*- country has no specific criteria regarding the listing of the 20th century Heritage

Appendix II: Twentieth-Century Heritage Practice Survey (HPS20): Questionnaire and Glossary 2024

Section 1 Committee Respondents Identification information

1. Which ICOMOS National Committee are you responding for?
(link answer to list of National Committees on ICOMOS website)
2. Please provide your name and contact details
Open answer
3. Please insert the name(s) and surname(s) of the people who contributed to completing this survey. The acknowledgement of these names will appear in the final report exactly as they are provided here.
Open answer
4. Please provide the names and contact details of the person(s) we can contact with any further questions that may arise about this survey? (Note, this information will not be published in the survey report).
Open answer. Provide e-mail and name.
5. Please, confirm that you agree that the survey information will be published by ISC 20C, noting that all data will be processed in accordance with the GDPR (EU) 2016/679.
Yes

Section 2 Identification of Twentieth-century heritage places

ISC20C takes a broad view of what constitutes twentieth-century heritage places by including in our work all forms of cultural heritage, tangible and intangible, such as buildings and other man-made structures, urban ensembles and plans, cultural landscapes, industrial and archaeological sites.

Aim: This section aims at understanding how your country **identifies** and significant Twentieth-century heritage **places**, who is involved, and if there are any guidelines and tools in use to support this work. **Identification** is the process of researching, surveying, and documenting places of potential heritage value.

1. What types of heritage research studies /surveys have been undertaken to **identify** and document potential Twentieth-century heritage places in your country? Select all that apply
 - a. Chronological (e.g. 1900-1945 etc)
 - b. Thematic (e.g. place type or historic themes)
 - c. Biographical (e.g. prominent designers, architects)
 - d. Typological (e.g. domestic architecture, industrial sites)
 - e. Stylistic (e.g. modernism, art deco etc)
 - f. Other, please describe.
2. Which government agencies, institutions, and civil society organizations are involved in the heritage **identification** and documentation processes in your country? Select all that apply
 - a. National government

- b. State/provincial government
 - c. Local government
 - d. Academia
 - e. Specialist interest groups (such as Docomomo, ICOMOS, National Trust, NGOs, Community heritage organization)
 - f. Other.
3. Please specify the names of the government agencies, institutions, and civil society organizations you selected in the previous question.
Open question
4. In your country, is there an inventory of significant Twentieth-century heritage places (whether or not they are listed and legally protected)? For example Docomomo or UIA inventories
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I don't know
- If yes, please specify and provide available references or links to the different inventories.
5. Please use the space below if you want to add other comments about Twentieth-century heritage place **identification**.
Optional Open answer

Section 3 Legal Protection for Twentieth-century heritage Places

Aim: This section aims to develop an understanding of the legal framework for protecting Twentieth-century heritage places in your country. Please consider local/state /provincial listing processes as well as national legal frameworks in your answer.

1. Please estimate how many Twentieth-century heritage places are **listed** (see definition) in your country? Where there are multiple administrative level of protection (National, State, Local), please answer for the national level and add comments on any specific circumstances or limitations to your answer in the comments section below. If the information needed to make such an estimate is not available to you, please select "I don't know" and note the reasons in the next question.
- a. <50
 - b. 50-500
 - c. 500-5000
 - d. >5000
 - e. I don't know
2. Please provide comments on your answer:
Open question
3. What criteria does your country use to **assess** and **list** heritage places? In this question we are not asking specifically about Twentieth-century heritage but the heritage of all ages, at a national level. Select all that apply
- a. Historic values
 - b. Historical association to people or events
 - c. Aesthetic/creative/technical achievement
 - d. Social values
 - e. Intangible or spiritual values
 - f. Research potential

- g. Rarity
- h. Representativeness
- i. **Authenticity**
- j. **Integrity**
- k. Other, please specify

Please provide a link to a reference explaining the national heritage criteria used in **listing** in your country, if available.

Open question

4. Are there any legal criteria or regulatory constraints that impact or prevent the **listing** of Twentieth-century heritage places in your country?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I don't know

IF YES: What are they? Select all that apply

- a. Official age/ time limit (if so, what is the minimum age that a place can be listed)
- b. Unofficial age/ time limit (if so, please describe)
- c. The demise of the designer/author (the author must not be living)
- d. Comparative analysis required
- e. Other, please specify.

2. What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been **listed** in your country? How old were they when they were **listed**? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of **Listing** if readily available
- Open answer

3. Who can propose Twentieth-century heritage places for **listing** in your country? Select all that apply
 - a. Government agencies
 - b. Owners
 - c. Civil Society Organizations
 - d. Specialist organizations (ICOMOS, Docomomo, etc.)
 - e. Others, please specify.
 - f. No limits- anyone can propose a place for listing
 - g. I don't know.
4. Is the heritage inventory dedicated to or that includes the **listed** Twentieth-century heritage places in your country publicly available?
 - a. Not applicable, there is no heritage inventory that includes Twentieth-century heritage places
 - b. Yes (please provide the link)
 - c. No (access is limited)
 - d. I don't know

If you answered yes, please provide the link

5. At what level of administration does the **listing** of Twentieth-century heritage places happen in your country? Select all that apply.
 - a. Federal/National
 - b. State
 - c. Local
 - d. Other

6. What kind of protection and incentives does the **listing** of heritage places provide?
Select all that apply

- a. Control of demolition
- b. Control of alterations/change of use
- c. Financial support for conservation work (grants, incentives)
- d. Control of development nearby
- e. Other, please specify

7. Please provide a link/reference to key information/documents about national legal protection in your country

Open answer

8. Does your country have Twentieth-century heritage places listed on the World Heritage List (WHL)?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. I don't know

If it does, please list below the Twentieth-century heritage places on the WHL for your country.

Open answer

9. Does your country have any Twentieth-century heritage places on the Tentative List for World Heritage nomination?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. I don't know

10. If it does, please list below the Twentieth-century heritage places on the Tentative World Heritage List .

Open answer

11. Please use the space below if you want to add anything else about the topic of legal protection of Twentieth-century heritage places in your country.

Optional open answer

Section 4 Use of the *Twentieth Century Historic Thematic Framework* to identify Twentieth-century heritage places

Aim: This section aims to understand about your country's experiences in using a **thematic approach** to **identifying** Twentieth-century heritage places.

International experience has shown that using themes to develop surveys successfully broadens outcomes through analyzing historical contexts and linkages, rather than focusing on chronological analysis alone or on architectural styles or sites that are simply visually or historically prominent.

1. In 2021, ISC20C collaborated with the Getty Conservation Institute (GCI) to develop *Twentieth Century Historic Thematic Framework*, a useful tool for professionals, heritage agencies, and communities needing to recognize, conserve, and interpret their significant Twentieth-century heritage places survey. This Framework is available at [this link](#) in English, French, and Spanish.

Has this Framework been used in your country?

- a. Yes
- b. Not yet
- c. I don't know

If you selected yes, please say if and how it has been useful. Please provide a link or reference to the case.

2. Are the ten global historic themes identified in the *Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework* useful and relevant for survey and **identification** in your country?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. I don't know

IF YES: Which themes/ subthemes are most relevant/useful to your country? Select all that apply

- Theme 1. Rapid Urbanization and the Growth of Large Cities
- Theme 2. Accelerated Scientific and Technological Development
- Theme 3. Mechanized and Industrialized Agriculture
- Theme 4. World Trade and Global Corporations
- Theme 5. Transportation Systems and Mass Communications
- Theme 6. Internationalization, New Nation-States, and Human Rights
- Theme 7. Conserving the Natural Environment, Buildings, and Landscapes
- Theme 8. Popular Culture and Tourism
- Theme 9. Religious, Educational, and Cultural Institutions
- Theme 10. War and Its Aftermath

3. Are there any themes or sub-themes that are missing/not relevant/different in your country?

Open answer

4. How can the TCHTF be disseminated effectively in your country? Do you have any suggestions on how ISC20C could facilitate or promote the use of the TCHTF in your country?

Open answer

Section 5 Use of best practice guidelines– the *Madrid New Delhi Document* -in caring for Twentieth-century heritage places.

The ISC20C has drafted a key guideline document setting out the approach and the principles that should be applied to managing and interpreting twentieth-century heritage sites and places. The *Approaches for The Conservation of Twentieth-Century Cultural Heritage*, aka Madrid-New Delhi Document, 2017 (MNDD) was endorsed and promoted for circulation by the ICOMOS General Assembly in 2017. You can access the most recent version of the document through https://isc20c.icomos.org/policy_items/madrid-new-dehli-doc/ it has been translated into 17 languages and is considered to be an international benchmark.

We'd like to know how the MNDD is being used in your country, and if you have any suggestions for change or expansion.

1. How useful have you found the MNDD in caring for Twentieth-century heritage places?
 - a. Never heard of it
 - b. Not useful
 - c. Useful
 - d. Very useful
2. How is the MNDD being used in your country?
Open answer.
3. Is there anything that the ISC20C can do to make the MNDD more useful or broadly used in your country (e.g. publish an illustrated version, workshops, develop a short video explaining its content and possible applications)?
Open answer.
4. Has your country developed reference documents, guidelines and best practice standards focused on the conservation of Twentieth-century heritage? If so, what are they?
Open answer.

Section 6: Looking back: How Twentieth-century heritage places conservation evolved since 2000.

Aim: Identify how key issues impacting Twentieth-century heritage places have changed and how practice has evolved since 2001 and understand what has caused these changes

1. Since 2001, how have key issues changed regarding Twentieth-century heritage places in your country?

	Significant ly improved	Improve d	Stayed the same	Worsene d	Significantl y worsened	I don't know
Public appreciation of Twentieth-century heritage has						
Legal protection of Twentieth-century heritage has						
Advocacy for Twentieth-century heritage places has						
Inclusion of Twentieth-century heritage in surveys and studies and inventories has						
Availability of guidelines about caring for Twentieth-century heritage has						
General audience' and owners/stewards' knowledge and expertise about Twentieth-century heritage has...						
Information about modern materials and construction technology has...						
Technical and professional expertise in the conservation of Twentieth-century heritage has...						
Incentives to support Twentieth-century heritage conservation have...						

2. Why do you think things have changed in your country for Twentieth-century heritage places?
Open answer

3. Since the first ISC20C survey in 2001, have there been any changes to the heritage legislation or the introduction of specific policies or incentives to support the conservation /management of Twentieth-century heritage places in your country?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I don't know

IF YES: Which were the changes? Please specify or provide links
4. Please provide a short list of publications or websites focused on the conservation of Twentieth-century heritage in your country (national bibliography). We will add these to the bibliography on the ISC20C website.

Open answer.
5. Please identify up to 10 civic, national, or local groups active in twentieth heritage conservation in your country, and briefly describe their activities.

Open answer. Please provide links if possible

Section 7: Looking Ahead: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities for conserving Twentieth-century heritage places

Aim: To conclude the survey, we would like to invite you to look ahead- what do you see as the main challenges and opportunities emerging for Twentieth-century heritage places in your country?

- On a scale 1 to 5, how are the following issues adversely impacting Twentieth-century heritage in your country?
1 = not affecting at all 5 = very strongly affecting

	1	2	3	4	5	I don't know
Lack of value public appreciation of Twentieth-century heritage						
Lack of legal protection/support by the authorities						
Lack of a comprehensive survey of Twentieth-century heritage						
Listing constraints mean that significant Twentieth-century heritage places are not being legally protected						
Insufficient legal protection for Twentieth-century heritage places even when listed						
Insufficient professional knowledge/expertise accessible to support the conservation of Twentieth-century heritage places						
Technical challenges in conserving modern materials and building technologies						
Frequency of needing heritage advocacy						
Insufficient financial resources or incentives that support Twentieth-century heritage places						
Impacts of urban development and redevelopment pressure						
Incompatible alterations and change						
Impact of war or targeted destruction/damage						
Impacts of climate change on Twentieth-century heritage						
Risk of incompatible alterations /interventions to increase energy efficiency						
Impact of functional redundancy/obsolescence, loss of original use						
Other (please specify below)						

If you selected "other" please elaborate
Optional open answer

- If you selected that climate change is adversely impacting Twentieth-century heritage, please describe how.
Optional open answer

3. If so, what sort of **climate change adaptation** measures are taken regarding Twentieth-century heritage places in your country?

Optional open answer

4. Does your country have a policy framework or guidance documents on energy efficiency, sustainability or climate change that addresses directly Twentieth-century heritage?
- Yes (please cite)
 - No
 - I don't know

IF YES: Please elaborate or add links and references to case studies

Open answer

5. Please suggest three ways in which ISC20C could build climate literacy regarding conserving Twentieth Century heritage.

Open answer

6. On a scale 1 to 5, how are the following factors benefitting Twentieth-century heritage conservation in your country?

1 = factor not observed or not benefitting 5 = factor observed and strongly benefitting

	1	2	3	4	5	I don't know
Rising popular appreciation and interest						
Legal protection for Twentieth-century heritage places is easier to obtain						
National funding and incentives for Twentieth-century heritage are available						
International Twentieth-century heritage programs and funding are available						
More guidance documents and knowledge are available						
Increased retention of structures for sustainability reasons						
Other, please specify						

If you selected "other" please elaborate here

Optional open answer

7. On a scale 1 to 5, how strongly do you see these trends impacting Twentieth-century heritage places in your country over the next 5 years?

1 = trend not perceived 5 = very strong trend

	1	2	3	4	5	I don't know
Broadening of the types of places considered to be significant Twentieth-century heritage (beyond architecture for example)						
Increasing recognition of intangible community/social values of Twentieth-century heritage places						

Increasing engagement of communities in Twentieth-century heritage conservation and management						
Increasing recognition and protection of the heritage of difficult Twentieth-century past (dissonant heritage)						
Increasing recognition and protection of Twentieth-century landscapes and urban areas						
Increasing adaptive reuse / retrofit projects involving TwentiethCentury heritage place in which climate change adaptation and/ or mitigation was a major driver						
Other (please elaborate below)						

If you selected “other” please elaborate here

Optional open answer

8. Please use the space below if you want to elaborate further on the topic of challenges and opportunities for Twentieth-century heritage conservation and management.
Optional Open answer

9. What sort of information, guidance or documents relating the conservation and management of Twentieth-century heritage would be useful in your country?
Open answer.

HPS20 Glossary

Terms Used in the Survey 2024

assessment is the process of developing a detailed understanding of the significance of a place by systematically analyzing its heritage values.

authenticity

Authenticity is the ability of a heritage place or site to express its cultural significance through its material attributes and intangible values in a truthful and credible manner. It depends on the type of cultural heritage place and its cultural context (ISC20c 2017, p. 12). "An authentic place is the honest product of its history and historical processes" (Croker 2017, p. 60). The degree of authenticity of a place refers to the extent to which its elements and attributes, both tangible and intangible, can be specifically linked to the events, people, period, aesthetic and/or social values that contribute to its significance.

climate change adaptation: In human systems, the process of adjustment to actual or expected climate and its effects, in order to moderate harm or exploit beneficial opportunities. In natural systems, the process of adjustment to actual climate and its effects; human intervention may facilitate adjustment to expected climate and its effects (IPCC, 2019b).

climate change mitigation measures - In climate policy, mitigation measures are technologies, processes or practices that contribute to mitigation, for example, renewable energy (RE) technologies, waste minimization processes and public transport commuting practices. See also mitigation options, and policies (for climate change mitigation and adaptation). (ICOMOS Climate Change and Cultural Heritage Working Group. 2019)

conservation

Conservation is an umbrella term that refers to "all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance" (Australia ICOMOS 2013, article 1.4). It may involve a number of processes including "retention or reintroduction of a *use*; retention of *associations* and *meanings*; *maintenance*, *preservation*, *restoration*, *reconstruction*, *adaptation* and *interpretation*; and will commonly include a combination of more than one of these. Conservation may also include retention of the contribution that *related places* and *related objects* make to the cultural significance of a place." (Australia ICOMOS 2013, article 14).

conservation management plan (CMP) or conservation plan

A document that "sets out what is significant about a place and from this, what policies are appropriate to enable that significance to be retained as part of its future use and development." In most cases, a CMP deals with the ongoing care of a place and management of change. (Kerr 2013, p. 1).

cultural significance

Cultural significance (also shortened to significance) means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social and/or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the heritage place or site itself, its attributes, its setting, fabric, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects. Heritage places may have a range of significances for different individuals or groups (ISC20c 2017, p.12).

identification is the process of researching, surveying, and documenting places of potential heritage value.

integrity

"Integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of a heritage places or site, its attributes and values. Examining the conditions of integrity therefore requires assessing the extent to which the place or site: a) includes all elements necessary to express its value; b) ensures the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the property's significance; c) suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect" (ISC20c 2017, p. 13).

legal protection refers to the legislation and associated processes that provide legal protection of heritage places in your country.

listing refers to the act of placing a property, site, landscape or other heritage place on a statutory list, register or inventory associated with the legal protection that invokes controls over any proposed changes to that heritage place. This can include listing an individual place or an area, cultural landscape conservation area or zone or route.

management plan

A management plan “is a document that, like a conservation plan, is used as a framework for managing a place including any future change but may be broader in scope including operational issues. Management plans are commonly used for cultural landscapes where ongoing active management is a primary conservation action” (ISC20c 2017, p. 13).

MNDD

Approaches to the Conservation of Twentieth Century Cultural Heritage Places aka Madrid-New Delhi Document, 2017

place

The term *place* “describes a geographically defined area of heritage significance. It includes objects, spaces and views, monuments, buildings, structures, archaeological sites, historic urban landscapes, cultural landscapes, cultural routes and industrial sites. It may have tangible and intangible dimensions” (ISC20c 2017, p. 13). See also “site,” which is a subset of place.

thematic approach to inventory/survey work informs and structures research and field work, identifying the historic processes/themes that defined the Twentieth Century, helping investigators to think broadly about identifying related places and sites of significance, how they relate to global, regional, national and local history.

twentieth Century Heritage includes all forms of cultural heritage, tangible and intangible, such as buildings and other man-made structures, urban ensembles and plans, cultural landscapes, industrial and archaeological sites. (Source:ISC20C Bylaws)

Works Cited

Australia ICOMOS. 2013. *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 2013*. Burwood, VIC: Australia ICOMOS. <https://australia.icomos.org/publications/burra-charter-practice-notes/>.

Alan Croker. 2017. *Respecting the Vision: Sydney Opera House—A Conservation Management Plan*, fourth edition. Sydney: Sydney Opera House. <https://www.sydneyoperahouse.com/about-us/how-we-work/strategies-and-action-plans/conservation-management-plan>.

ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage (ISC20c). 2017. Madrid–New Delhi Document: Approaches to the Conservation of Twentieth-Century Heritage. Paris: ICOMOS. <https://isc20c.icomos.org/resources/mndd/mndd-full-document-translations/>

ICOMOS Climate Change and Cultural Heritage Working Group. 2019. *The Future of Our Pasts: Engaging Cultural Heritage in Climate Action*. Paris: ICOMOS. <https://openarchive.icomos.org/id/eprint/2459/>

Kerr, James Semple. 2013. *Conservation Plan: A Guide to the Preparation of Conservation Plans for Places of European Cultural Significance*. 7th ed. Sydney, NSW: National Trust of Australia. <https://australia.icomos.org/publications/the-conservation-plan/>.

Appendix III: HPS20 Respondents

Note: Some contributors had included their titles and affiliations. These have been removed during editing to ensure consistency in how names are presented. No other changes were made.

ICOMOS Region	ICOMOS National Committee	Name(s) and surname(s) of the people who contributed to completing survey.
Arab States	Algeria * (No National Committee)	Maïssa Acheuk-Youcef (International Member, (Personal Response))
Arab States	Abu Dhabi Emirate * (One emirate of the UAE)	Amel Chabbi (Personal Response)
America	Argentina	Carolina Quiroga, Susana Villavicencio, Silvia Rossi, Gabriela Santibáñez, Alfredo Conti
Europe	Armenia	Nune Chilingaryan, Gagik Gyurjyan, Grigor Nalbandyan, Natalya Gyulnazaryan, Emma Harutyunyan, Suren Shaqaryan
Asia and the Pacific	Australia	Fiona Gardiner, Rachel Jackson, Helen Lardner, Susan Marsden, Louise Cox, Sheridan Burke, Robert Moore
Europe	Belgium	Eva Roels, Jean-Sébastien Misson
Europe	Bosnia Herzegovina	Elsa Turkusic Juric, Nina Stevanović, Aida Murtić
America	Brazil	Carla Coelho, Carolina Marques Chaves, Juliano Carvalho, Silvio Oksman
Europe	Bulgaria	Emilia Kaleva
America	Canada	Mathieu Dormaels, Manuela Senese
America	Chile	Josefina Atria Mira
Asia and the Pacific	China	YONG Xinqun, WANG Zhe, WANG Jue, ZHAO Yimeng
America	Colombia	Juan Luis Isaza Londoño
America	Costa Rica	Álvaro Campos, Rafael Venegas, Ofelia Sanou, Ricardo Chaves, Alfredo González, Eugenia Solís, Nancy Reyes, Gloria González
Europe	Croatia	Marko Spikic
Europe	Cyprus	Chrysanthos Pissarides, Emilia Siandou, Antroula Georgiou, Yiola Kourou, Kyriaki Kalava
Europe	Czech Republic	Petr Vorlík
Europe	Denmark	Ola Wedebruun, Grethe Pontoppidan, Alberte Klysner Steffensen, Caspar Jørgensen, Mia Kroer Ræbild, Svava Riesto, Ellen Braae, Arne Høi, Mette Lyhne, Lars Juel Thiis, Lene Skodborg, Lisbeth Hollensen, Margaret Gowen, Mogens Andreassen Morgen

America	Dominican Republic	Japonesa Julia Capellán Mejia, Risoris Silvestre, Gustavo Ubri
Europe	Estonia	Riin Alatalu, Laura Ingerpuu
Europe	Finland	Jonas Malmberg
Europe	France	Cédric Avenier, Jean-Pierre Blay, Antoine Bruguerolle, Jean-François Lagneau, Franca Malservisi, Chloé Mirouze, Anne-Laure Moniot, Eric Pallot, Isabelle Palmi, Serge Pitiot, Christiane Schmuckle-Mollard
Europe	Germany	Tino Mager, Kirsten Angermann, Jörg Haspel, Andreas Putz, Regina Stephan
Europe	Greece	Pamela Jerome, Sofia Avgerinou-Kolonias
Europe	Hungary	András Veöreös, Zorán Vukoszávlyev
Europe	Iceland	Alma Sigurdardottir
Asia and the Pacific	India	Kiran JOSHI, Annabel LOPEZ, Indrani SARKAR, Kanika BANSAL, Poonam VERMA MASCARENHAS, Nishant UPADHYAY, Sankar Krishna DAS, Dilip CHANGKAKOTY, Sanjib Kr BORKAKOTY
Asia and the Pacific	Iran	Mohammadreza RAHIMZADEH; Eskandar MOKHTARI TALEGHANI
Europe	Ireland	Angela Rolfe, John Beattie
Europe	Israel	Inbal Ben-Asher Gitler, Eran Mordohovich
Europe	Italy	Cettina Lenza, Ugo Carughi, Stefania Landi, Massimo Visone
Asia and the Pacific	Japan	Saikaku Toyokawa, Nobuko Inaba, Namiko Yamauchi
Arab States	Jordan	Rami Farouk DAHER
Europe	Lithuania	Aušra Černauskienė, Dainius Lebeckis, Vaidas Petrulis
Asia and the Pacific	Malaysia	Nor Hayati Hussain
America	Mexico	Enrique X. de Anda, Rocío Garza Leonard
Europe	Moldova	Sergius Ciocanu, Dumitru RUSU
Arab States	Morocco	Karim Rouissi, Abderrahim Kassou
Asia and the Pacific	Nepal	Kai Weise, Anie Joshi
Asia and the Pacific	New Zealand	Phillip Hartley
Africa	Nigeria	Samson Faboye, Oluwatoyin Sogbesan, Abubakar Sule Sani, Oluwasegun Esan, Friday Samson Awonusi, Daniel Ishaya
Europe	North Macedonia	Aneta Ribarska, Martin Efremovski, Kristina Biceva, Ana Ivanovska Deskova, and Konstantin Atanasov
Europe	Norway	Tom Davies

Asia and the Pacific	Philippines	Dominic Galicia
Europe	Poland	Andrzej Siwek
Europe	Portugal	Teresa Cunha Ferreira, Pedro Murilo de Freitas, Domingas Vasconcelos, Carlos Bessa
Europe	Romania	Rodica Crişan, Irina Iamandescu, Dumitru Rusu
Europe	Russian Federation *	Natalia Dushkina (Personal Response)
Arab States	Saudi Arabia	Adnan Adas
Europe	Serbia	Tanja Conley
Asia and the Pacific	Singapore	Kevin TAN, HO Weng Hin
Europe	Slovenia	Sonja Ifko, Tatjana Adamič
Africa	South Africa	Thabo Manetsi, Laura Robinson
Europe	Spain	Alfonso Muñoz Cosme, Andrés Martínez Medina, Ángela López Sabater, Horacio Fernández del Castillo Sainz, Idoia Camiruaga Osés, José Francisco Peral López, Julia Rey Pérez
Europe	Sweden	Henrik Nerlund
Asia and the Pacific	Thailande	Pongkwan Lassus
Europe	The Netherlands	Marieke Kuipers, Annette Koenders, Kees Somer, Lidwien Spoormans, Danielle Takens
Arab States	Tunisia	Faïka Béjaoui
Europe	Turkey	UMUT ALMAÇ, KORAY GÜLER, Yıldız SALMAN, Nilüfer BATURAYOĞLU YÖNEY, Ebru Omay POLAT, Nurdan KUBAN ORCAN, Güliz BİLGİN ALTINÖZ, Elvan ALTAN, Deniz ÖZKUT, Zeren ÖNSEL ATALA
Europe	United Kingdom	Catherine Croft, Stuart Tappin, Alison Hems
America	United States of America	Thomas "Gunny" Harboe, Kyle Normandin, Susan Macdonald
America	Uruguay	Ruben García Miranda
America	Venezuela	Francisco Alfonso Pérez Gallego, Carmen Natalia Dali Schelbart, Francisco Pérez Gallego, Maria Eugenia Bacci

Appendix IV: References and Links to Inventories

<i>In your country, is there an inventory of significant Twentieth-century heritage places (whether or not they are listed and legally protected)? For example Docomomo or UIA inventories. If you selected yes, please specify and provide available references or links to the different inventories.</i>	
Abu Dhabi Emirate	At the state level, the Abu Dhabi Historic Environment Record is an inventory that covers 20th century heritage. In addition, the Inventory of Abu Dhabi's Modern Heritage (IADMH) covers the built heritage from the 1960s onwards and feeds into the Abu Dhabi Historic Environment Record. Registered sites are placed on the Public Register. At the National level, an inventory of modern heritage sites is being developed across the 7 emirates (states).
Argentina	• National Commission of Monuments, Places and Historic Assets • DOCOMOMO International Register (1995 onwards) • DOCOMOMO Exhibition MOMOVE (2015): 100 cases listed
Armenia	n/a
Australia	Inventories focused on 20th-century heritage: • Australian Institute of Architects – Register of Significant Architecture (New South Wales) (2020) • Australian Institute of Architects – Register of Significant Architecture (New South Wales) (2021) • Royal Australian Institute of Architects - Register of Significant Twentieth Century Architecture (Victoria) (2022) • DOCOMOMO Australia Register State and local inventories, including 20th-century heritage: • Queensland Heritage Register • New South Wales State Heritage Inventory • NSW maritime Heritage Database • Aboriginal Heritage Information System In New South Wales, government departments that hold heritage assets also maintain registers: • Water New South Wales • Victoria Heritage Council Database • Tasmanian Heritage Register • South Australia Heritage Register • ACT Heritage Register • Northern Territory Heritage Register • Western Australia State Heritage Register
Belgium	- DoCoMoMO: https://www.docomomo-oregon.org/resources/ • Région de Bruxelles-Capitale : Inventaire du patrimoine architectural (1939-1999) • Le patrimoine du XXe siècle en Wallonie (1895-1989) - Les jalons régionaux de l'architecture moderne en Wallonie
Bosnia-Herzegovina	• National Monuments of Bosnia-Herzegovina • Cultural and historical heritage
Brazil	• Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional (IPHAN)
Bulgaria	• New Architectural Heritage Foundation • Bulgarian Modernist Architecture Foundation • Docomomo Bulgaria – MoMoVe: https://exhibition.docomomo.com/

Canada	There was a partial inventory made by DOCOMOMO Quebec. Information available at: • The DOCOMOMO International publication "The Modern Movement in Architecture: Selections from the Docomomo Registers", Dennis Sharp & Catherine Cooke editors (2000) • The DOCOMOMO International Virtual Exhibition (MoMove)
Chile	• Ministerio de Obras Públicas - Inventario del patrimonio inmueble • DOCOMOMO Chile • ICOMOS Chile • Grupo LAC S20
China	• National Cultural Heritage Administration - Information on immovable cultural relics: comprising 766,722 sites protected by the Cultural Relics Protection Law, and referring to immovable cultural relics at both provincial, city and county-level. • Architectural Heritage Projects (issued by the Committee on Twentieth Century Architectural Heritage of the Chinese Society of Cultural Relics). • Additionally, relevant documents are the List of National Industrial Heritage (issued by the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology of the People's Republic of China), with a total of six batches up to now; and the List of the First to Ninth Batches of China's Twentieth Century Cultural relics protection units at all levels.
Colombia	•
Costa Rica	• There are very few declarations for the protection of architecture in the International Style and later periods. However, there is a variety of declarations for architecture from the decades 1910–1950. • Ministerio de Cultura y Juventud de Costa Rica: its porta allows a research of heritage properties • Virtual Exhibition by the Universidad de Costa Rica Museum • "La Historia en Concreto" (The History in Concrete) documents the development of the first ten buildings of the Rodrigo Facio University City during the 1960s: A 2012 exhibition celebrates the history of the university city
Croatia	• The Register of Cultural Property of the Republic of Croatia
Cyprus	• The national inventory of heritage sites (listed and non-listed) is managed by the Department of Town Planning and Housing and is not public. • DOCOMOMO Cyprus: 100 most important buildings, sites and neighbourhoods (Also available at the Docomomo Virtual Exhibition website) • DOCOMOMO Homework inventories (are managed by the local chapter of DOCOMOMO) • USHer application
Czech Republic	Databases on DOCOMOMO Czech Republic :
Denmark	• FBB (National database for all nationally listed building) Industrial heritage inventories: • Industrikultur • National list of industrial sites • Kold Krig: National list of sites related to the Cold War • Verdenskrigs kulturspor: Cultural traces of World War II • Velfærdssamfundet: National theme related to the welfare society, no list of sites): • DOCOMOMO Denmark entries at the DOCOMOMO Registers • By og Land Danmark: National NGO, list of own listing proposal
Dominican Republic	Cultural Property Inventory Centre (CIBC), with its website under construction: http://centrodeinventario.blogapot.com

Estonia	• Register of cultural monuments - Inventory of 20th century architecture (2007) • Mapping and analysis of valuable Estonian 20th-century architecture: Thematic studies on railway stations, dairies, schools, municipality houses, prayer houses, military heritage, heritage conservation areas, etc. • Register of cultural monuments - Rural architectural heritage database • Register of cultural monuments - Military architecture
Finland	• DOCOMOMO Finland: In Finnish and English • Museovirasto (in Finnish language only)
France	• DOCOMOMO inventory by National Committee experts • ICOMOS 20th century heritage list • Inventory by the French Ministry of Culture and regional cultural affairs departments. • The label <i>Architecture contemporaine Remarquable</i> (ACR) launched in 1999 under the name <i>Patrimoine du XXe siècle</i> and renamed ACR in 2016. It identifies buildings and productions less than 100 years old that are not protected as historical monuments. The aim is to show the interest of recent constructions that anyone can live in and visit, to make the link between old heritage and current architectural production, and to encourage their reuse by adapting them to the expectations of citizens (ecological, memorial, societal, economic...). The ACR label only concerns buildings that are less than one hundred years old and not protected as historic monuments. The list is therefore liable to change not only each year, but also throughout the year, depending on any new measures for protection as historic monuments that may be signed in the region (inscription) or by the Minister (classification). Data is updated every Thursday at 7:00 am.
Germany	• Inventories of significant Twentieth-century heritage places exist at the regional/state level of the federal states.
Greece	• Monumenta • DOCOMOMO Greece
Hungary	About 130 buildings protected on National level, over 250 more protected on local level (under city governance)
Iceland	To some extent by the Heritage Agency and local governments
India	n/a
Iran	• Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Tourism and Handicrafts
Ireland	• National Inventory of Architectural Heritage: Not limited to 20th century heritage, but searchable by chronology (i.e., 1900-1999) • Record of Protected Structures which is included in each City and County Development Plan (relatively few entries are 20th century heritage)
Israel	• https://exhibition.docomomo.com/
Italy	• Ministry of Culture, General Directorate of Contemporary Creativity - Census of Italian architecture from 1945 to the present day • For listed places, see http://vincoliinrete.beniculturali.it
Japan	There are various lists in Japan related to this issue (#4). Matters directly connected to the cultural protection and designation system under the National Cultural Protection Laws are all managed by the Agency for Cultural Affairs (ACA), with local governments following their guidance. This system has been systematically and continuously maintained since the 19th century, but it does not include a separate category specifically for the 20th-century heritage. Before establishing a new protection category, the ACA made it a rule to conduct a nationwide survey, and inventories must be created. The decision to develop a new category is made after consulting with an expert committee (deliberative council), and the surveys are carried out by the 47 prefectures, with the cooperation of local experts. In the field of 20th-century heritage, the following areas have been surveyed so far, with each prefecture publishing its report or inventory:

	- Industrial heritage related to Japan's modernization (referred to as modernization heritage, which can also include civil engineering and transportation. This is closely aligned with the concept of 'industrial heritage' generally). - Japanese-style modern romantic architecture (referring to modern Japanese-style architecture). - A comprehensive survey of modern cultural heritage, regardless of whether intangible, tangible, movable, or immovable, involves all departments of the ACA. (These inventories are not available digitally, but are publicly accessible through public libraries) [ed. Nihon Kenchiku Gakkai, Nihon Kindai Kenchiku Souran: Kakuchini Nokoru Meiji Taisho Showa no Tatemono, monogram 422p, Gihodo Shuppan, 1980 is the compilation of the entire research. Available at: dlsearch.ndl.go.jp/books/R100000002-I000001453767] Although there is no legal protection, other government agencies also offer official recognition from their own perspectives, such as selecting civil engineering monuments, industrial heritage, or historic engineering machines that have influenced modern Japanese history. The following URLs provide some of these selections. While not exhaustive, they are chosen with legitimate criteria. However, these lists tend to be static rather than dynamic, with occasional reviews and updates. Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry - Modern Civil Engineering Heritage List Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport, and Tourism - Japan's Modern Civil Engineering Heritage The Japan Society of Mechanical Engineers Additionally, DOCOMOMO Japan made its first selection of 100 buildings in 2000, and since then, the organization updates its list almost annually. Currently, 290 buildings are listed. As a general rule, selected buildings must have been completed after 1920, have existed for at least 35 years at the time of selection, still be standing, and retain their original architectural value. DOCOMOMO Japan - Registration List ICOMOS Japan NSC 20ISC also worked on selection of the 20th century heritage in 2017. (Original press release is available pages 13-15) https://icomosjapan.org/media/ICOMOS_10_11_web.pdf
Jordan	1. TURATH for Studies and Design did an inventory for Amman's historic areas architectural and urban heritage where approximately 1700 have been listed. The client was Greater Amman Municipality. This inventory was finished around 2011 but was not updated afterwards. 2. Greater As-Salt Municipality did several inventories of its historic cores covering more than 600 heritage buildings within the historic core of the City.
Lithuania	n/a
Malaysia	Malaysian Architecture Archive
Mexico	INBAL's National Catalogue of Works of Artistic Interest
Moldova	Socialist Modernism www.socmonumntalart.com/ Socialist Realism
Morocco (Kingdom of)	Atlas of Casablanca's architectural heritage produced by the Casablanca Urban Agency
Nepal	ICOMOS inventory on 19th and 20th Century Architectural and Industrial Heritage in Nepal Volume 1
New Zealand	DOCOMOMO New Zealand - Long Live The Modern, publication ed. Dr Julia Gatley
Nigeria	National Commission for Museums and Monuments Nigeria Lagos State of Nigeria - Official Gazette Bauchi State of Nigeria : inventory of immovable cultural heritage. Final report, 2004
Norway	The National Agency for Cultural Heritage The Directorate for Cultural Environment Management

Philippines	• mASEANa 20 Significant Metro Manila Buildings 1945-1986 • Dominic Galicia Architects - Report from Manila, 2021
Poland	Regional list: • Atlas of the contemporary cultural assets of the Małopolska voivodeship • SARP (Association of Polish Architects) Warsaw - List of contemporary cultural assets • The Institute of Architecture presents the Krakow Architecture Trails project • Modernism in Katowice Route of Modernism
Portugal	• IAP20: Survey of 20th Century Portuguese Architecture (Inquérito à Arquitectura Portuguesa do século XX), 2007. • H.Atlas Porto. Atlas of Architectural Heritage Design. Contributions from the School of Porto • Mapping Public Housing. A critical review of the State-subsidized residential architecture in Portugal (1910-1974) • Cure & Care. Architecture and Health (1901-1976) (Curar e Cuidar. Arquitetura e Saúde em Portugal (1901-1976)) • Educational Buildings built under the Centenários Plan in Lisbon – 1944-1961 (Grupos Escolares construídos ao abrigo do Plano dos Centenários em Lisboa — 1944-1961) • DOCOMOMO Ibérico • SIPA: Architectural Heritage Inventory System (“Sistema de Inventário do Património Arquitectónico”) • PDMS: Municipal Master Plans (“Planos Diretores Municipais”) – in the Heritage Map (“Carta de Património”)
Romania	• Architects' Chamber of Romania, INFOROM Cultural Foundation - Buildings for the national cultural heritage (1959-1977) • DOCOMOMO Romania • Socialist Modernism • Soc Monumental Art • Socialist realism • Defense Architecture
Russian Federation	20th century properties are listed in the general Russian Federal register of cultural heritage, as well as in the general Regional / Municipal registers (for example, for Moscow, St. Petersburg, Yekaterinburg, Novosibirsk and other regions), but without being allocated to a separate lists. All information is open to the public, including a web format. Separate Lists of the 20th century sites are compiled during the identification process by the Regional / Municipal heritage protection bodies, working groups within the Union of Architects, as well as by international groups (for example, DOCOMOMO_Russia). In the future, the ICOMOS Russian National Scientific Committee on 20th century heritage, which is currently under creation, proposes to compile / select separate 20th century monument lists that are already included in the Registers, as well as the list of potential candidates.
Saudi Arabia	Saudi ICOMOS list for 20th century architectural heritage
Serbia	• DOCOMOMO Serbia website • Municipal institutions for cultural property websites • Periodicals and books • Scholarly work by academia
Singapore	• DOCOMOMO Singapore - 'Modernist 10 • Singapore Heritage Society: Our Modern Past publication
Slovenia	• DOCOMOMO Slovenia • Društvo arhitektov Ljubljana, Association of Architects Ljubljana
Spain	• Instituto del Patrimonio Cultural de España (IPCE), DOCOMOMO - 256 edificios de la Arquitectura del Siglo XX (1925-1965) • ARCHXX Registro SUDOE. La arquitectura del siglo XX en España, Gibraltar y las regiones francesas de Aquitaine, Auvergne, Languedoc-Roussillon, Limousin, Midi-Pyrénées y Poitou-Charentes. Fundación Arquia and Fundación Docomomo Ibérico.

	• Arquitectura del Sol/ Sunland Architecture. CSCAE, 2022 • Antón Capitel. Arquitecturas del siglo XX. Ediciones Asimétricas • Instituto del Patrimonio Cultural de España (IPCE) - Estudio y adaptación al Plan Nacional de Conservación del Patrimonio del siglo XX de los inventarios de arquitectura de ese siglo en España • Instituto del Patrimonio Cultural de España (IPCE), DOCOMOMO - Estudio y catalogación de 400 edificios de la arquitectura del Movimiento Moderno realizada en España entre 1965 y 1975 • Guía de Arquitectura de la Provincia de Alicante. Colegio Territorial de Arquitectos de Alicante and Instituto Gil-Albert, 1999. See: ◦ http://hdl.handle.net/10045/43191 ◦ https://www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra/guia-de-arquitectura-de-la-provincia-de-alicante/ • Instituto del Patrimonio Cultural de España (IPCE) - Jesús Ángel Sánchez García and Irene Calvo Mosquera. Inventario y selección de salas cinematográficas del siglo XX • DOCOMOMO Ibérico - La arquitectura de la industria, 1925-1965 • Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico and Junta de Andalucía - Registro Andaluz de Arquitectura Contemporánea • Comunidad Valenciana. Generalitat Valenciana and Colegio Oficial de Arquitectos de la Comunidad Valenciana - Registro de Arquitectura del siglo XX • DOCOMOMO Ibérico - Registro de edificios de la Fundación DOCOMOMO Ibérico
Sweden	• Swedish National Heritage Board - Bebyggelseregistret, BeBR (Data Base of Built Heritage) • Bebyggelseregistret (BeBR)
Thailand	• List of registered buildings under the Act on Monuments, Ancient Objects, Objects of Art and National Museum on Department (accessible via the website of The Fine Arts Department in Thai language, difficult to search, not specific to 20th-century heritage). • Architectural Conservation Award by the Association of Siamese Architects, under Royal Patronage (ASA): ◦ www.asa.or.th ◦ www.asaconservationaward.com • DOCOMOMO Thailand inventory
The Netherlands	There have been two nation-wide databases: • MIP inventory for built heritage 1850-1940 • Wederopbouwatabank (built heritage of the period 1940-1965) Based on these, there is a multitude of publications and related websites, but all in Dutch. The national digitised databases of the inventoried buildings and areas are under re-construction. And so there are no links available at this moment for national inventories Selection of local/provincial references: • Erfgoed Wederopbouwjaren gemeente Oost Gelre • Erfgoed van de Wederopbouw (City of Utrecht) • Wijkraad Molenhoek For Post65 places: • The Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands (RCE) - Report Exploration Post 65. New perspectives between prosperity and resistance, 2019 • International New Town Institute - Post65 Groeikernenkring, 2020 For specific styles: • Amsterdamse School Platform Wendingen • DOCOMOMO Netherlands (NB: not updated)
Tunisia	• Institute National du Patrimoine • ASM de Tunis (Association de Sauvegarde de la Médina de Tunis) • DOCOMOMO Tunisia • Edifices Mémoires

Türkiye	• DOCOMOMO Türkiye: List accessible, inventory fiches are accessible upon request • DOCOMOMO International MOMOVE project - Türkiye Cases • Inventories published by the Chamber of Architects in Türkiye (the most comprehensive ones by branches of Ankara, İstanbul, İzmir and Adana) Inventories not specific to but including 20th-century heritage: • Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism • İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality • VEKAM Civilian Architectural Memory of Ankara Project (Sivil Mimari Bellek Ankara Projesi) • Cultural Inventory Initiative (Kültür Envanteri): However, the inventory of this private initiative is not prepared by experts on the heritage of 20th century.
United Kingdom	Listings are available through the relevant agency - e.g.: • Historic England • Historic Environment Scotland
United States of America	• National Park Service - National Register of Historic Places • DOCOMOMO US - Explore Modern project As stated above, pretty much every State and many municipalities have surveys of historic places which include modern heritage. There are too many to list.
Uruguay	• Facultad de Arquitectura de la Universidad ORT Uruguay - Patrimonio Moderno del Sur (2015)
Venezuela	1980s to Early 1990s: The Directorate of Historical, Artistic, and Environmental Heritage, attached to the National Council of Culture (CONAC), initiated an inventory of movable and immovable assets at the national level before the creation of the Institute of Cultural Heritage (IPC). The inventory included "National Historic Monuments," a heritage protection category established in 1945 with the enactment of the Law for the Protection and Conservation of Antiquities and Artistic Works of the Nation, published in the Official Gazette on August 15, 1945. The authority to decide on declared assets rested with the "National Protecting and Conserving Board of Historical, Artistic, and Environmental Heritage," created by the same law. This board made declarations between 1956 and 1994 covered many buildings and historic centers. However, modern heritage properties were less represented than those from the pre-Hispanic, colonial, and republican periods. However, this inventory covered only some states in the country. The inventories from the registered states are available in paper format at the Library Archives of the Institute of Cultural Heritage. 1995 to 1998: The Institute of Cultural Heritage (IPC), established by law in 1993, continued the project by launching a Pre-Inventory of Venezuelan Cultural Heritage by state or province. This was structured as a conceptual platform and Inventory Project for Cultural Heritage. It was built on previous national experiences by the Directorate of Heritage of CONAC, forming the basis for registering some entities or urban centers. This Inventory Project aligned with the objectives set by the 1993 Law on the Protection and Defense of Cultural Heritage and introduced the "Cultural Interest Asset" category, in addition to the existing "National Historic Monuments," without abolishing the previous declarations. 2003: The IPC hired Fundamemoria, led by architect Hannia Gomez (current President of DOCOMOMO Venezuela), to conduct a Modern Pre-inventory of Caracas. The project resulted in the creation of 2,300 heritage records of buildings in Caracas. Partial information on the results and news is currently available on their website. DOCOMOMO Venezuela: Modern Movement. 2004 to 2010: The "Participatory Census of Venezuelan Cultural Heritage 2004-2010" was carried out for each municipality nationwide. This census significantly expanded the recognition of cultural assets, focusing on built heritage, intangible heritage, traditions, gastronomy, and more. The built heritage category notably included many 20th-century architectural assets. A substantial part of the catalog is available online at: • Catálogo del Patrimonio Cultural Venezolano

	The Council of Preservation and Development (COPRED, CUC) Developed the "Information System for Heritage Management of the UCV" - SIGPUCV. This system compiled the inventory of the Art Works of the University City of Caracas, a World Heritage site. This collection, called "Synthesis of the Arts," includes 108 works. It is available online at: • Universidad Central de Venezuela The inventory of immovable assets categorized buildings into four types: Type 1: Buildings with heritage value Type 2: Buildings that allow localized interventions Type 3: Buildings not foreseen in the original design Type 4: Other buildings These lists can be accessed through images on this link: • Universidad Central de Venezuela - Sistema de Información para la Gestión Patrimonial de la UCV 2014: Another inventory initiative was launched in the metropolitan area of Caracas and its surrounding regions, promoted by the Junta de Andalucía in Latin American countries. This led to an inventory of built heritage in Caracas and La Guaira, resulting in the publication of the "Caracas del Valle al Mar. Guide to Architecture and Landscape," which includes a significant number of modern heritage assets. Though it was published as a book, it is also available online at guiaccs.com.
--	---

Appendix V: References and Links to the Heritage Lists

<i>Is the heritage inventory dedicated to or that includes the listed Twentieth-century heritage places in your country publicly available? If you responded yes, please provide link to the heritage inventory</i>	
Abu Dhabi Emirate	Please note that we are mandated by law to make the list public. We are in the process of developing our website and also creating a platform so that the public can interface with the register. Currently we only have a landing page: https://abudhabiculture.ae/en/learn/cultural-programmes/modern-heritage
Algeria	There is no accessible, detailed, nationwide inventory of all the significant sites of the 20th century, dedicated specifically to heritage dating from this period throughout Algeria.
Argentina	https://www.argentina.gob.ar/cultura/monumentos/bienesdeclarados-normativa
Armenia	https://hy.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D5%80%D5%A1%D5%B5%D5%A1%D5%BD%D5%BF%D5%A1%D5%B6%D5%AB_%D5%BA%D5%A1%D5%BF%D5%B4%D5%B8%D6%82%D5%A9%D5%B5%D5%A1%D5%B6_%D6%87_%D5%B4%D5%B7%D5%A1%D5%AF%D5%B8%D6%82%D5%B5%D5%A9%D5%AB_%D5%A1%D5%B6%D5%B7%D5%A1%D6%80%D5%AA_%D5%B0%D5%B8%D6%82%D5%B7%D5%A1%D6%80%D5%B1%D5%A1%D5%B6%D5%B6%D5%A5%D6%80%D5%AB_%D6%81%D5%A1%D5%B6%D5%AF
Australia	Its NOT dedicated to C20, it includes: Australian Heritage Places Database https://www.dcceew.gov.au/parks-heritage/heritage/publications/australian-heritage-database
Belgium	Regional Heritage Databases Flanders : https://inventaris.onroerendergoed.be/ ; Wallon Heritage Agency (AWAP): https://lampspw.wallonie.be/dgo4/site_ipic/ ; Brussels Heritage Agency: https://monument.heritage.brussels/
Bosnia Herzegovina	http://kons.gov.ba/Publication/Read/nacionalni-spomenici-tabela; https://nasljedje.org/kulturno-istorijsko-nasljedje/
Brazil	considering the federal policies and the local ones, we are indicating the federal agency http://portal.iphan.gov.br/
Bulgaria	The inventories are compiled by the National Institute of Immovable Cultural Heritage (http://ninkn.bg/) They are arranged in regions once for national and world categories: http://ninkn.bg/Documents/categoryPreview/13# (only in Bulgarian) and for all other categories in separate links for each region on the same website under the tab “Национален публичен регистър на недвижимите културни ценности” (only in Bulgarian)
Canada	Depending on the provinces, but in quebec the inventory is available at https://www.patrimoine-culturel.gouv.qc.ca/ and there's a partial federal inventory at https://www.historicplaces.ca/fr/pages/register-repertoire.aspx
Chile	https://arquitectura.mop.gob.cl/patrimonioinmueble/Paginas/indice.aspx
China	Link to the National Heritage List of National Heritage Units : http://www.ncha.gov.cn/col/col2289/index.html ; (Eight batches in total. The link is to the latest batch) Link to the National Industrial Heritage List : https://www.miit.gov.cn/cms_files/filemanager/1226211233/attach/202410907087582fcb435c9f2ab3e828162f61.pdf (Six batches in total. The link is to the latest batch) China's 20th Century Architectural Heritage List

Costa Rica	The MCJ Portal (https://www.patrimonio.go.cr) provides access to information on listed heritage properties: MCJ Search Portal. There are very few listings for the protection of architecture in the International Style and later periods. However, there are numerous listings for architecture from the 1910–1950 decades.. https://www.patrimonio.go.cr/busqueda/ResultadoBusquedaInmuebles.aspx .
Croatia	https://registar.kulturnadobra.hr/#/
Cyprus	The above reply applies to the national official inventory of heritage places
Czech Republic	https://pamatkovykatalog.cz/uskp but the list has no https://pamatkovykatalog.cz/uskp , without special section on Twentieth century
Denmark	https://www.kulturarv.dk/fbb/index.htm (not specifically for 20th century heritage)
Dominican Republic	http://centrodeinventario.blogspot.com
Estonia	https://register.muinas.ee/public.php?menuID=architecture
Finland	https://www.kyppi.fi/palveluikkuna/portti/read/asp/default.aspx
France	https://www.pop.culture.gouv.fr/search/list?base=%5B%22Patrimoine%20architectural%20%28M%C3%A9rim%C3%A9%29%22%5D
Germany	https://www.vdl-denkmalpflege.de/ueber-uns/denkmaldatenbanken
Hungary	official list is restricted in access https://www.oeny.hu/oeny/ivo/ and there is a non-official civil organized web-page: https://muemlekem.hu/
Iceland	https://www.minjastofnun.is/is/byggingararfur/fridlyst-hus-og-mannvirki
India	There is no inventory exclusively dedicated to 20th century heritage, though 20th century places are included in numerous lists of the central, state and local governments. It is not possible to mention all here. If needed, this can be worked on later.
Ireland	Each local authority is responsible for maintaining its own Record of Protected Structures which are available online at each of the respective 26 local authority websites. The National Built Heritage Service is in the process of developing a National RPS however the dataset will not initially include information on the date range of buildings included on the Record of Protected Structures.)
Italy	The listed heritage entries are shared online on the website http://vincoliinrete.beniculturali.it
Japan	https://bunka.nii.ac.jp
Lithuania	https://kvr.kpd.lt/#/static-heritage-search ; https://autc.lt/en/home/
Malaysia	https://www.heritage.gov.my/my/tapak-warisan
Moldova	www.romd.socialistmodernism.com/ www.socmonumntalart.com/ www.socialistrealism.org/
New Zealand	Docomomo NZ - Long Live The Modern publication ed. Dr Julia Gatley
Nigeria	https://museum.ng/national-monuments-in-nigeria/list-of-national-monuments/
North Macedonia	http://uzkn.gov.mk/mk/registri/
Norway	https://www.kulturminnesok.no/

Poland	The inventory is available in the form of voivodeship (regional) lists of monuments and information on the zabytek.pl website. https://zabytek.pl/pl
Portugal	Listed Heritage Atlas is available online: < https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=7f7d5674280f41849c0a0869ced22d91 >. The heritage institution does not provide a platform that chronologically distinguishes Twentieth-Century Heritage.
Romania	https://www.inforom-cultural.ro/5+5/en/cladire-circ.php https://www.docomomo.ro/ www.romd.socialistmodernism.com/ www.socmonumntalart.com/ www.socialistrealism.org/
Russian Federation	Federal and Regional lists including 20th century heritage. Russian Ministry of Culture, Unified State Register of Cultural Heritage Sites [which includes more than 150 thousand objects of cultural heritage] https://culture.gov.ru/activities/information_systems/edinyy_gosudarstvennyy_reestr_obektoy_kulturnogo_naslediya/ Moscow Department of Cultural Heritage https://data.mos.ru/opendata/530 Saint Petersburg, Committee for State Control, Use and Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments https://kgiop.gov.spb.ru/deyatelnost/uchet/list_objects/ and other regional bodies.
Serbia	The Website of the Institute of the Protection of the Cultural Heritage of Belgrade as well as the website of the State Institute for the protection. Docomomo Serbia also provides a decent base on its website.
Singapore	https://www.ur.gov.sg/maps/?service=conservation ; https://www.docomomo.sg/modernist-100/category/Conserved
Slovenia	The heritage of the 20th century in Slovenija is listed in the Register of Immovable Cultural Heritage, which is kept by the Ministry of Culture: https://geohub.gov.si/ghapp/giskd/
South Africa	www.sahris.sahra.org.za
Spain	https://www.cultura.gob.es/cultura/patrimonio/bienes-culturales-protegidos.html
Sweden	https://www.raa.se/in-english/digital-services/about-bebr/
The Netherlands	there is not one overall 20C heritage inventory
Tunisia	Institut National du Patrimoine (INP) website www.inp.rnrt.tn ; Association Sauvegarde de la Médina de Tunis (ASM) www.asmtunis.com ; Municipality of Tunis www.commune-tunis.gov.tn ; Docomomo Tunisia https://docomomo-tunisie.jimdosite.com/ ; Edifices et Mémoires www.edifices-et-memoires.com
United Kingdom	<u>Listings are available through the relevant agency - e.g.</u> https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/ https://www.historicenvironment.scot/advice-and-support/listing-scheduling-and-designations/listed-buildings/search-for-a-listed-building/
United States of America	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/database-research.htm
Uruguay	https://inventariociudadvieja.montevideo.gub.uy/
Venezuela	https://albaciudad.org/catalogo-del-patrimonio-cultural-venezolano/

Appendix VI: References and Links to National Heritage Criteria

Please provide a link/reference to the national heritage criteria used for listing your country.	
Abu Dhabi Emirate	The executive guidelines for Abu Dhabi's Cultural Heritage Law are available here: https://www.abudhabi.gov.ae/-/media/sites/adgov/gazettes/2019/en/2019-e4-en.ashx
Algeria	The text of Law n°98 - 04 on the protection of cultural heritage: https://www.joradp.dz/FTP/Jo-Francais/1998/F1998044.pdf
Argentina	Presidencia de la Nación Cultura, Comisión Nacional de Monumentos, de Lugares y de Bienes Históricos - Requisitos para la declaratoria de monumentos históricos
Armenia	Agency for the protection of Monuments of History and Culture Protection
Australia	Commonwealth Heritage List criteria
Belgium	In Flanders, heritage places are classified through the Flemish Heritage Agency. This body assesses sites based on criteria like historical, artistic, scientific, and social-cultural value, with particular emphasis on architectural distinctiveness and environmental integration. Agency for Immovable Heritage - Valuing heritage: heritage values and criteria. Assessment framework (2023) Similarly, Wallonia, via the Agence wallonne du Patrimoine (AWaP), evaluates heritage sites by looking at their cultural, historical, and aesthetic significance. Brussels also follows its unique guidelines through the Monuments & Sites agency, focusing on sites that hold historical or artistic value within the city.
Brazil	IPHAN - Política de Patrimônio Cultural Material
Bulgaria	REGULATION NO N-12 OF 21 NOVEMBER 2012 ON THE PROCEDURE FOR IDENTIFICATION, DECLARATION, GRANTING OF STATUS AND DETERMINATION OF THE CATEGORY OF IMMOVABLE CULTURAL PROPERTY, ACCESS AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES SUBJECT TO ENTRY IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF IMMOVABLE CULTURAL PROPERTY Article 21, paragraph 2 (only in Bulgarian)
Canada	Depending on the province legislation or the federal laws applicable to the heritage places, criteria may vary but, everyone of them could be used. Information can be found at Le Répertoire canadien
Chile	Ministerio de Obras Publicas (MOP) - Patrimonio Inmueble
Colombia	Ministerio de Cultura - Declaratoria de Bienes de Interés Cultural del Ámbito Nacional
Costa Rica	In the Regulations for Law No. 7555, "Law of Historical Architectural Heritage of Costa Rica," No. 32749 , refer to Article 3 – Criteria. To determine the historical and architectural value of a property, the following criteria will be taken into account:
Croatia	Ministry of Culture and Media – Rules on the form, content and manner of maintaining the register of cultural property of the Republic of Croatia

Cyprus	According to local legislation, the Minister of Interior issues Preservation Orders for "buildings with special architectural, historical, social or other special interest or character" (Republic of Cyprus, 1972. The Town and Country Planning Act of 1972 (Article 38, 2b). Available at Declaring Protected Buildings. While there are no further official national heritage criteria for listing, the aforementioned criteria are used in practice.
Czech Republic	Act No. 20/1987 Coll. - Act of the Czech National Council on State Monument Care
Denmark	• Building Conservation Act • Slots- og Kulturstyrelsen, national listing • Slots- og Kulturstyrelsen, local listing
Dominican Republic	There is no link where one could find the criteria associated with the definition of cultural heritage. These criteria are found at the National Directorate of Monumental Heritage.
Estonia	Minister of Culture - General criteria for the national protection of monument types and heritage conservation areas, and value classes of buildings located in heritage conservation areas
Finland	https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/2010/20100498 (law text in Finnish), https://www.museovirasto.fi/en/cultural-environment/built-cultural-environment (description of protection in Finland)
France	https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Aides-demarches/Protections-labels-et-appellations/Protection-au-titre-des-Monuments-historiques The national criteria are based on the reputation of the designing architect and the authenticity of the site at the time of consideration. In the case of French Guiana, a French department created in 1946, historical value is also important.
Germany	Martin, Dieter J., Michael Krautzberger, Dimitrij Davydov. 2022. Handbuch Denkmalschutz und Denkmalpflege. München.
Greece	There is no formal national heritage criteria used for listing.
Hungary	https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a1800068.kor
Iceland	https://www.minjastofnun.is/is/byggingararfur/fridlyst-hus-og-mannvirki
India	The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act (AMSAR Act) 2010 - https://asi.nic.in/pdf/act2010.pdf
Iran	Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Tourism and Handicrafts (MCHTH)
Ireland	Refer to section 2.5.3 through section 2.5.20 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities https://www.buildingsofireland.ie/app/uploads/2019/10/Architectural-Heritage-Protection-Guidelines-for-Planning-Authorities-2011.pdf
Israel	https://www.nevo.co.il/law_html/law01/044_001.html
Italy	The Italian heritage law "Cultural Heritage and Landscape Code" (Codice dei beni culturali e del paesaggio, Decreto legislativo n. 42/2004, available at https://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/sommario/codici/beniCulturali) explain the reference typologies and criteria used for listing.
Japan	Cultural Heritage Online https://bunka.nii.ac.jp
Lithuania	https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.254663?jfwid=

Malaysia	https://www.heritage.gov.my/my/info-jwn/dasar-perundangan.html
Mexico	https://www.cultura.gob.mx/monumentos/
Moldova	https://www.legis.md/cautare/getResults?doc_id=133811&lang=ro#
Morocco	This is done within the framework of law n° 22-80 relating to the conservation of historic monuments and sites, inscriptions, objects of art and antiquities, promulgated by dahir n° 1- 80-341 of safar 17, 1401 (December 25, 1980) http://www.auks.ma/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Loi_n_22-80_relative.pdf
Nepal	https://lawcommission.gov.np/en/?cat=94
Nigeria	https://museum.ng/
North Macedonia	http://uzkn.gov.mk/mk/%d0%bf%d1%80%d0%b0%d0%b2%d0%b8%d0%bb%d0%bd%d0%b8%d1%86%d0%b8-2/ http://uzkn.gov.mk/mk/%d0%b7%d0%b0%d0%ba%d0%be%d0%bd%d0%b8/
Norway	https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/1978-06-09-50
Philippines	https://ncca.gov.ph/philippine-registry-cultural-property-precup/
Poland	https://isap.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/download.xsp/WDU20031621568/U/D20031568Lj.pdf
Portugal	According to art. 2, item 1, of the Law for Cultural Heritage n. 107/2001, cultural heritage is defined by “values of civilization or culture that sustain relevant cultural interest”. In the art. 2, item 3, this relevant cultural interest is classified as “historical, paleontological, archaeological, architectonical, linguistic, documental, artistic, ethnographic, scientific, social, industrial or technical, which must reflect values of memory, age, authenticity, originality, rarity, singularity or exemplarity”. The official text is published in the following link (in Portuguese): < https://diariodarepublica.pt/dr/legislacao-consolidada/lei/2001-72871514 >.
Romania	https://legislatie.just.ro/Public/DetaliiDocumentAfis/204161 https://legislatie.just.ro/Public/DetaliiDocument/95750
Russian Federation	The preservation of the 20th century properties in Russia is executed under the Federal Law “On objects of cultural heritage (monuments of history and culture) of the peoples of the Russian Federation” № 73-FZ (2002) signed by the President of Russia and being the follow up of the USSR Law on monument protection (1976). https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_37318/?ysclid=m4e43fw2s0355553896 Article 3. Objects of cultural heritage (historical and cultural monuments) of the peoples of the Russian Federation “Cultural heritage sites (historical and cultural monuments) of the peoples of the Russian Federation (hereinafter - objects of cultural heritage) for the purposes of this Federal Law include objects of immovable property (including objects of archaeological heritage) and other objects with historically related territories, works of painting, sculpture, decorative and applied art, objects of science and technology and other objects of material culture that arose as a result of historical events that are valuable from the point of view of history, archaeology, architecture, urban planning, art, science and technology, aesthetics, ethnology or anthropology, and social culture. They are evidence of epochs and civilizations, genuine sources of information about the origin and development of culture”.

	- urban, architectural, artistic, scientific, construction, social and memorial values attributed to a given monument or site; - typological and functional values; - aspects of rarity, uniqueness in evolution processes; - creative style and methods associated with the outstanding masters in architecture; - construction skills; - comparative analysis. As for heritage assets of every historical period, the following operations are permitted for the 20th century monuments under the 2002 Federal Law № 73-FZ “On objects of cultural heritage (monuments of history and culture)”: protection, conservation, repair, restoration, adaptation. Articles 40-44 of this law describe each of these operations. For instance, restoration of a monument or ensemble involves “scientific research, survey, design and construction works carried out in order to identify and preserve the historical and cultural value”, Art. 44; in its turn, “Adaptation of object of cultural heritage for modern use means scientific research, design and construction works carried out in order to create conditions for the modern use of the cultural heritage object, including the restoration of elements representing historical and cultural value of this object”. Heritage preservation in general ensured by the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation, which acts through Regional and Municipal bodies for monument protection. Moscow and Saint Petersburg as Russian historical metropolitan cities have strong heritage protection bodies. However whereas the heritage of previous centuries is considered worthy of protection and generally preserved, when it comes to 20th century buildings certain difficulties still arise in terms of insufficient historical perspective, public and authorities’ misunderstanding, ideological connotation of the Soviet past, advocating for modernism, as well as preservation of authentic material substance, functional misuse, etc. Until recent, there were no specific policies for the protection of young heritage. However some recently completed projects, and first of all the accurate restoration of Alvar Aalto’s Library in Vyborg (1927-1935; restoration 1992-2013) and later of the Narkomfin building in Moscow (1929-1932; restoration 2016-2020), give hope for gradual elaboration of clear methodological approaches for the 20th century monuments consonant to the existing international conservation principles.
Saudi Arabia	saudi heritage law
Serbia	No manual applies to all cases. The listing results from discussions among experts in a particular field and long-lasting participation in ICOMOS activities, making the international declarations and case studies the keystone for valorization and further treatment of the monuments.
Singapore	1. Planning Act < https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/PA1998?ProvIds=pr9-&ViewType=Within&Phrase=conservation&WiAI=1 > 2. Preservation of Monuments Act < ">https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/PMA2009?ProvIds=P12-#pr4-> >
Slovenia	https://www.gov.si/assets/ministrstva/MK/DEDISCINA/ISeD/VOD/Prirocnik-za-vrednotenje-VOD-verzija-1.0.pdf
South Africa	www.sahris.sahra.org.za
Spain	https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-1985-12534
Sweden	https://www.raa.se/in-english/cultural-heritage/historic-environment-laws/historic-environment-act-1988950/
Thailand	www.finearts.go.th (All in Thai language)

	NB we have three legal criteria since 1988 (before slightly different), apart from the general requirement that an eligible monument must regard an immovable object of 'general interest' at an (inter)national level, because of its: - Beauty - Cultural Historical Value and/or - Significance for science These criteria were further elaborated for built heritage of the period 1850-1940, including also 'rarity' and 'intactness/recognizability'; effectively, only 'rarity' of the 10 criteria below (g.) is applied, albeit only if in combination with other criteria; some of the Dutch criteria show partly similarities with a, c and j (the order of boxes above). Due to temporary policy rules (2007 and 2009), the criteria for selection of post-war heritage have been sharpened as a base for designating a 'Top 100' in two shifts: 1940-1958, 1959-1965. These introduced the concept of 'excellence'. Young heritage buildings had, by then, to meet one or two of the following criteria: "evident milestones in the development of architecture, urban planning, land planning, building technology or space-related art - or essential paragons of the most important cultural-historical or socio-historical developments of the period 1940-1958/1959-1965", respectively. - Back, A. de, Coenen, J., Kuipers, M.C. & Röling, L.C. (eds.), Gesloopt, gered, bedreigd. Omgaan met naoorlogs erfgoed, Rotterdam 2004 - RDMZ, Handleiding selectie en registratie jongere stedebouw en bouwkunst (1850-1940) [MSP], Zeist 1991 - Kuipers, M. C. (2008). Nieuw Erfgoed Erkend, reflecties. Bulletin KNOB, 107(4), 155–165. [with English summary] https://doi.org/10.7480/knob.107.2008.4.172 - Kuipers, M.C. (2012), 'De culturele grondslagen van de Monumentenwet', Bulletin KNOB 111(2012) nr 1, 10-25 [with English summary] https://doi.org/10.7480/knob.111.2012.1.98 - RCE, Monumenten van Herrezen Nederland, Amersfoort/Zwolle 2007 - RCE, Waarderingscriteria bouwkunst, Richtlijn 2019 [pdf see www.cultureelerfgoed.nl] - RCE (2013), "Monumenten van de prille Welvaartsstaat, selectievoorstel Beschermingsprogramma Wederopbouw 1959-1965 " [https://www.ndfr.nl/content/blg-216282] The so-called Post65 heritage is not yet selected for legal protection (national level), but a general overview of themes and qualities has been published and many lower authorities have already listed recent heritage dating after 1965. [see names mentioned in section 2, sub 3]. - RCE (2019), Rapportage Verkenning Post 65, Post 65, Nieuwe perspectieven tussen welvaart en weerstand: www.cultureelerfgoed.nl/verkenning_Post_65_PDFA
The Netherlands	
Turkey	https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuat?MevzuatNo=2863&MevzuatTur=1&MevzuatTertip=5 https://teftis.ktb.gov.tr/TR-263861/korunmasi-gerekli-tasinmaz-kultur-ve-tabiati-varliklarinin-tespit-ve-tescili-hakkinda-yonetmelik.html
United States of America	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/publications.htm
Uruguay	https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-educacion-cultura/patrimonio-uruguay

Venezuela	Although a new Cultural Heritage law is in the works, the current law, published on October 3, 1993, can be consulted at the following link: https://www.asambleanacional.gob.ve/storage/documentos/leyes/ley-de-pro-20220322151140.pdf
-----------	--

Appendix VII: References to Key Information on National Legal Protection

<i>Please provide a link/reference to key information/documents about national legal protection in your country</i>	
Abu Dhabi Emirate	https://www.abudhabi.gov.ae/-/media/sites/adgov/gazettes/2019/en/2019-e4-en.ashx
Algeria	The text of Law n°98 - 04 on the protection of cultural heritage: https://www.joradp.dz/FTP/Jo-Francais/1998/F1998044.pdf
Argentina	National Commission of Monuments, Places and Historic Assets - Listed Sites National Commission of Monuments, Places and Historic Assets
Armenia	https://escs.am/en/static/monuments?s=culture
Australia	https://www.dcceew.gov.au/parks-heritage/heritage/publications/australian-heritage-database ; see also later listings in survey
Belgium	Flanders: https://www.onroerenderfgoed.be/regelgeving Brussels: https://urbanisme.irisnet.be/lesreglesdujeu/le-code-bruxellois-de-lamenagement-du-territoire-cobat Wallonia: https://agencevallonneedupatrimoine.be/le-nouveau-code-wallon-du-patrimoine/
Bosnia Herzegovina	https://nasljedje.org/propisi/ ; http://kons.gov.ba/Content/Read/zakoni-o-provedbi-odluka-komisije
Brazil	http://portal.iphan.gov.br/
Bulgaria	https://lex.bg/bg/laws/ldoc/2135623662 Cultural Heritage Law (only in Bulgarian)
Canada	There isn't a centralized information point. For the Province of Quebec, information may be found at these links: https://www.quebec.ca/culture/patrimoine-archeologie/proteger-chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj ; https://www.mcc.gouv.qc.ca/file-admin/documents/publications/mcccf-statut.pdf
Chile	https://www.monumentos.gob.cl/publicaciones/libros/ley-monumentos-nacionales-normas-relacionadas-ano-2019#:~:text=La%20Ley%20N%C2%BA%2017.288%20de,conservaci%C3%B3n%20de%20nuestro%20patrimonio%20monumental . https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.minvu.gob.cl/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/DDU-400-Patrimonio-1.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwic36nihvCJAXgGLkGHYeSJKEQFnoECBwQAQ&usg=AOvVaw2RsqtCkNjqSqtMbAO7FzOq https://ecommerce.inn.cl/nch3332201345840 https://www.patrimoniourbano.cl/documento-12/ https://www.inn.cl/nch33892020 https://www.bcn.cl/leychile/navegar?idNorma=265641 https://www.patrimoniocultural.gob.cl/legislacion-y-convenciones

China	Law of the People's Republic of China on the Protection of Cultural Relics https://flk.npc.gov.cn/detail2.html?MmM5MDImZGQ2NzhiZjE3OTAxNjc4YmY4N2U1NjBhYjk%3D Rules for the Implementation of the Law of the People's Republic of China on the Protection of Cultural Relics https://www.gov.cn/banshi/2005-08/21/content_25090.htm China formally acceded to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage on 12 December 1985
Colombia	https://www.mincultura.gov.co/areas/patrimonio/preguntas-frecuentes/Paginas/default.aspx
Costa Rica	The current Law and Regulations on Historical Architectural Heritage of Costa Rica (Cultural Heritage) is governed by Law 7555. https://www.patrimonio.go.cr/quienes_somos/legislacion/decretos/Ley%20N%C2%B0%207555%20Ley%20de%20Patrimonio%20Historico%20Arquitectonico%20de%20Costa%20Rica.pdf Center for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage. MCJ Ministry of Culture and Youth. Claudio Vargas: Heritage and its Legal Protection. https://www.patrimonio.go.cr/biblioteca_digital/publicaciones/2007/tutela_juridica.pdf
Croatia	https://www.zakon.hr/z/340/Zakon-o-za%C5%A1iti-i-o%C4%8Duvanju-kulturnih-dobara
Cyprus	Department of Town Planning and Housing website. Νομοθεσία και Κανονισμοί που διέπουν Διατηρητέες Οικοδομές (Laws and Regulations relating to Listed Buildings). Available at https://www.moi.gov.cy/moi/tph/tph.nsf/lawsregulations_el/lawsregulations_el?OpenDocument
Czech Republic	https://www.npu.cz/pamatky-a-pamatkova-pece
Denmark	https://slks.dk/omraader/kulturarv/fredede-bygninger/fredningssager-og-hoeringer/bygninger-der-kan-fredes
Dominican Republic	www.gacetaoficial.gob.pa (Where the laws for the protection of heritage are found, such as Law 318-68, Law 492-69, Law 41-00, Law 176-07, and all decrees related to heritage). www.tribunalconstitucional.gob.do (Contains resolutions TC/0037/16, TC/0208/14, TC/107/18, TC/0330/15, TC/0169/16, TC/0359/19) www.observatorioserviciospublicos.gob.do/baselegal/constitucion2010 (Constitution of the Dominican Republic, Art. 64) http://centrodeinventario.blogspot.com
Estonia	Conservation Act https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/531032023002/consolide
Finland	https://www.museovirasto.fi/en/cultural-environment/built-cultural-environment/protection-under-the-act-on-the-protection-of-the-built-heritage

France	Consult the DRACs and the Base Mérimée (Ministry of Culture website) https://www.pop.culture.gouv.fr/search/list?base=%5B%22Patrimoine%20architectural%20%28M%C3%A9rim%C3%A9%29%22%5D
Germany	Martin, Dieter J., Michael Krautzberger, Dimitrij Davydov. 2022. Handbuch Denkmalschutz und Denkmalpflege. München.
Greece	https://www.law-archaeology.gr/index.php/en/greek-cultural-herutage-law#:~:text=The%20main%20Greek%20law%20protecting,are%20practically%20not%20in%20force.
Hungary	(new law is under evolution, but still) https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a1800068.kor
Iceland	https://www.minjastofnun.is/is/byggingararfur/fridlyst-hus-og-mannvirki
India	The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act (AMSAR Act) 2010 - https://asi.nic.in/pdf/act2010.pdf
Iran	Book: Yunes SAMADI RENDI, Collection of laws, regulations, bylaws, circulars, and treaties on cultural heritage of the country, Tehran: ICHO, 2004.
Ireland	The Planning & Development Act 2000 https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2000/act/30/enacted/en/html The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities https://www.buildingsofireland.ie/app/uploads/2019/10/Architectural-Heritage-Protection-Guidelines-for-Planning-Authorities-2011.pdf
Israel	https://www.nevo.co.il/law_html/law01/044_001.htm
Italy	Italian heritage law "Cultural Heritage and Landscape Code" (Codice dei beni culturali e del paesaggio, Decreto legislativo n. 42/2004, available at https://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/sommario/codici/beniCulturali)
Japan	https://www.bunka.go.jp/seisaku/bunkazai/index.html
Jordan	Law No. 5 of 2005 on the Protection of Architectural and Urban Heritage, Jordan https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/11237
Lithuania	https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.254663?jfwid=https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.15165
Malaysia	https://www.heritage.gov.my/my/info-jwn/dasar-perundangan.html
Mexico	dmartinez@inba.gob.mx
Moldova	Ministry of Culture, Moldova https://www.mc.gov.md/
Morocco (Kingdom of)	http://www.auks.ma/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Loi_n_22-80_relative.pdf
Nepal / Népal	https://lawcommission.gov.np/en/?cat=94
New Zealand	N/A
Nigeria	https://gazettes.africa/archive/ng/1982/ng-government-gazette-supplement-dated-1982-08-19-no-41-part-b.pdf
North Macedonia	Law on the protection of cultural heritage in Macedonian language: http://uzkn.gov.mk/mk/%d0%b7%d0%b0%d0%ba%d0%be%d0%bd%d0%b8/

Norway	https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/1978-06-09-50
Philippines	National Cultural Heritage Act of 2009. https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2010/03/26/republic-act-no-10066/
Poland	https://isap.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/download.xsp/WDU20031621568/U/D20031568Lj.pdf
Portugal	The “Law for Cultural Heritage n. 107/2001” is available at the link: < https://diariodarepublica.pt/dr/legislacao-consolidada/lei/2001-72871514 >.
Romania	The National Institute of Heritage, Romania https://patrimoniu.ro/
Russian Federation	The Federal Law №73-FZ “On objects of cultural heritage (monuments of history and culture) of the peoples of the Russian Federation” (2002) signed by the President of Russia https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_37318/?ysclid=m4e43fw2s0355553896
Saudi Arabia	saudi heritage law
Serbia	The measures of protection are announced in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia on the day of proclamation of some building, complex or site as a national monument.
Singapore	Planning Act https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/PA1998?ProvIds=pr9-&ViewType=Within&Phrase=conservation&WiAl=1 Preservation of Monuments Act https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/PMA2009?ProvIds=P12-#pr4-
Slovenia	All information on the protection of 20th century heritage is available in the Register of Immovable Cultural Heritage https://geohub.gov.si/ghapp/giskd/
South Africa	National Heritage Resources Act no 25 of 1999 www.gov.za
Spain	National Plan for Cultural Heritage of the 20th Century: https://www.cultura.gob.es/planes-nacionales/planes-nacionales/conservacion-patrimonio-cultural-sigloxx.html
Sweden	https://www.raa.se/in-english/cultural-heritage/historic-environment-laws/historic-environment-act-1988950/
Thailand	www.finearts.go.th (all in Thai language and difficult tho find the documentation)
The Netherlands	https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0038125/2016-06-30 www.cultureelerfgoed.nl/monumenten-aanwijzen-en-afvoeren Handreiking Borging van Post 65 erfgoed NB Due to recent changes in the legal framework, the Monumentenwet 1988 does no longer exist. It is nowadays part of the 2016 Erfgoedwet (for designating monuments) and the act on physical planning, the Omgevingswet, valid since 1-1-2024 (for issuing permits).
Tunisia	- The 1986 law (extending legal protection to buildings less than 100 years old) - Heritage code Law no. 94-35 of February 24, 1994 relating to the heritage code and traditional arts - Tunisia

Turkey	https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuat?MevzuatNo=2863&MevzuatTur=1&MevzuatTertip=5
United Kingdom	n/a
United States of America	National Register only protects in the case of Federal funds being used, or for tax credit incentives. Local designation is typically the one that provides protection, but not in all cases. Again there are literally hundreds of municipalities with local preservation laws. Some protect, some do not.
Uruguay	https://www.impo.com.uy/bases/leyes/14040-1971
Venezuela	https://www.asambleanacional.gob.ve/storage/documentos/leyes/ley-de-pro-20220322151140.pdf www.rpc-venezuela.gob.ve http://www.diversidadcultural.gob.ve/salvaguardia/registro-del-pci-venezolano-para-la-humanidad/

Appendix VIII: Five Youngest Twentieth-Century Heritage Places Listed

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
Abu Dhabi Emirate	Khalad bin Swied Al Ansari Mosque, Al Ain 2-11-12-5. Built in 1983. Registered in 2023. Abu Dhabi Media Company HQ, Abu Dhabi Sector E22-P49, mid-1980s, Registered in 2022. Corniche Tower, Abu Dhabi Sector E5-C26, built in 1984. Registered in 2023. Corniche Hospital, Abu Dhabi Sector E12-P24, Built in 1984. Registered in 2023. Haseen Rashid al Kumeet Al Hajri, Abu Dhabi Sector E9_02-C30. Built in 1984. Registered in 2023. Al Shahama Souk. Al Shahamah New P178. Built in in the mid-1980s. Registered in 2023.									6					
Algeria	I don't know														1
Argentina	Properties declared national monuments, designed and built from 1948 onwards: - By decree of the National Executive Power 2297/2015, the series of Hogares Escuelas (School Homes) built by the Eva Perón Foundation in different cities across the country between 1948 and 1953 were declared National Historic Monuments. Projects: Technical Office of the Construction Department of the Eva Perón Foundation. Evita Home School, Esteban Echeverría district, Buenos Aires province; Eva Perón Home School, Santiago del Estero; Fray Mamerto Esquiú Home School 601, Catamarca;							3	1	1					

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	Monseñor José de la Iglesia Home School (formerly Cnel. Domingo A. Mercante Home School), San Salvador de Jujuy; Carmen Puch de Güemes Home School (formerly Coronel Juan D. Perón Home School), Salta; Home School No. 13 Presidente Juan Domingo Perón (formerly Presidente Perón Home School), Corrientes; Coronel Juan D. Perón,“ San Juan; Home School No. 9020 "Coronel Juan Perón,“ Granadero Baigorria, province of Santa Fe; Provincial Administrative Center (formerly Home School Coronel Perón), La Rioja; Liceo Militar General Roca (formerly Home School Presidente Perón), Comodoro Rivadavia, province of Chubut; Home School "Eva Perón" M° 8-448 (formerly Hogar Escuela "17 de Octubre"), Mendoza. - Escuela Hogar "Eva Perón", 1948. Calle Don Bosco 749, Paraná, Province of Entre Ríos. Project: Technical Office of the Construction Department of the Eva Perón Foundation. Property of National Historical and Artistic Interest, 2007. - Chapadmalal and Embalse Río Tercero Tourist Complexes, 1940-1950. Chapadmalal, Province of Buenos Aires, and Embalse Río Tercero, Province of Córdoba. Declared National Historic Monuments, 2015. - "Ingeniero Paitoví" Water Reservoir, 1948-1957. Entre Ríos 1441, Buenos Aires City. Project: National Sanitation Works. National Historic Monument, 2022. - Dr. Curutchet's House, 1948-1954. Av. 53 between 1 and 2, La Plata. Author: Le Corbusier. National Historic Monument, 1987. - Hangars 3 and 4, Ministro Pistarini Airport, 1950. Ezeiza, province of Buenos Aires. National Historic Monument, 2009.														

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
- Luna Park Stadium, 1952 (renovation). Avenida Eduardo Madero 412, Buenos Aires. Architects: Chiaporri and Quiroz. National Historic Monument, 2016. - Córdoba City Hall, 1953. Marcelo T. de Alvear 1120, Córdoba. Architect: SEPRA Studio. National Historic Monument, 2019. - Santa Rosa Civic Center, Province of La Pampa, 1955-1976. Architect: Clorindo Testa. Declared a National Urban Historic Area, 2022. - Nuestra Señora de Fátima Chapel, 1956-1959. Avenida del Libertador 13900, Martínez, Province of Buenos Aires. Author: Claudio Caveri. National Historic Monument, 2007. - Domingo Faustino Sarmiento Teacher Training College, 1956-1964. Catamarca 170, Leandro N. Alem, Province of Misiones. Architects: Mario Soto and Raúl Rivarola. National Historic Monument, 2012. - Banco Hipotecario S. A. (formerly Banco de Londres), 1959-1963. Reconquista corner Bartolomé Mitre, Buenos Aires. Authors: Estudio SEPRA and Clorindo Testa. National Historic Monument, 2009. - Manuel Belgrano Higher School of Commerce, 1960-1971. Calle La Rioja 1350, Córdoba. Designers: Osvaldo Bidinost, Jorge Chute. National Historic Monument, 2019. - Faculty of Architecture of the University of Mendoza, 1962-1964. Paseo Dr. Emilio Descotte 750, Mendoza. Architect: Enrico Tedeschi. National Historic Monument, 2019. - National Library, 1962-1992. Agüero 2505, Buenos Aires. Architect: Clorindo Testa. National Historic Monument, 2019.															

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020		
	- SOMISA Building, 1966-1970. Av. Belgrano 751, Buenos Aires. Architect: Mario Roberto Álvarez. National Historic Monument, 2015. In addition to those mentioned above, provincial governments have also made declarations, for example, in the province of Tucumán, the Eva Perón Home School (1950), declaration 2022, and the University City Housing of the National University of Tucumán, San Javier (1954), declaration 2022. Translated with DeepL.com (free version)															
Armenia	Cold-Storage Facility. 9/4 Arshakunyac Avenue, Yerevan, Republic of Armenia, 1951. Date of Listing - 2004 Sardarapat Memorial. Daniel Bek-Pirumyan Street, Araks, Armavir Marz, Republic of Armenia, 1968. Date of Listing - 2004. Komitas Chamber Music House. 1 Isahakyan street, Yerevan, Pepublic of Armenia, 1977. Date of Listing - 2004. Republic Square Metro Station of Karen Demirchyan Yerevan Subway. 1981, 46 Nalbandyan street, Yerevan, Republic of Armenia, 1981. Date of Listing - 2004. Marshal Baghramyan Metro Station of Karen Demirchyan Yerevan Subway. 1981, 42 Baghramyan Avenue, Yerevan, Republic of Armenia. Date of Listing - 2004.							1	1	1	2					
Australia	1. Federation Square, designed and constructed between 1996 and 2002 .In Victoria, the fight against Apple putting a store in Federation Square was fundamental in bringing the issue of Twentieth Century heritage to public and state government attention (https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/places/201519)										4	1				

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	2. Botanic Gardens , South Australia (1989) https://data.environment.sa.gov.au/Content/Publications/20996_Summary.pdf														
	3.Melbourne Aids Memorial Quilt made from 1988 onwards (https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/places/208302)														
	4. St Michael and St John Catholic Church Horsham 1987 (https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/places/45385)Bicentennial Conservatory Adelaide														
	5. Queensland Cultural Centre (built in stages 1976-1988) https://apps.des.qld.gov.au/heritage-register/detail/?id=602844														
	BY STATE														
	Youngest building on the Queensland Heritage Register is Queensland Cultural Centre (built in stages 1976-1988) https://apps.des.qld.gov.au/heritage-register/detail/?id=602844														
	Bicentennial Conservatory Adelaide Botanic Gardens , South Australia (1989) https://data.environment.sa.gov.au/Content/Publications/20996_Summary.pdf														
	Sydney Opera House (opened 1973) National List 2005 listed on World Heritage in 2007														
	Tocal Agricultural College (1965) NSW Listed 2013														
	MLC North Sydney (1957) NSW Listed 2023														
	Academy of Science (1959) National List 2005														

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020		
	National Gallery ACT (1980) National listed 2007 High Court ACT (1980) National listed 2007 Youngest listed for Victoria on Victorian Heritage Register: Federation Square, designed and constructed between 1996 and 2002 .In Victoria, the fight against Apple putting a store in Federation Square was fundamental in bringing the issue of Twentieth Century heritage to public and state government attention (https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/places/201519) Melbourne Aids Memorial Quilt made from 1988 onwards (https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/places/208302) St Michael and St John Catholic Church Horsham 1987 (https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/places/45385) Shell House Melbourne, constructed 1985-89 (https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/places/197961) Melbourne Cricket Ground (1956)National listed 2005															
Belgium	Identifying the five youngest heritage-listed sites from the 20th century in Belgium is complex, as the official heritage listing agencies do not publish such a specific "youngest" list. However, notable examples of 20th-century sites recently listed include: 1-The private house of architecte Roger Bastin (1913-1988) (Namur), constructed in 1970. 2-La Cambre Abbey and Campus in Brussels, designed by modernist architects in the 1920s, was preserved for its architectural and cultural impact on 20th-century Belgian education and design.				1	1		1	1	1						

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	3-Modernist Housing by Léon Stynen (in Antwerp), constructed between the 1930s and 1950s, showcases post-war architecture styles that reflect Belgium's mid-century urban evolution. Listed status came in recent years due to growing appreciation for mid-century modernism. 4-The Atomium in Brussels, constructed for the 1958 World Expo, has been listed for its distinctive architecture symbolizing atomic energy and science, marking a significant cultural moment in the 20th century. 5-University Buildings of the Catholic University of Leuven, developed in the 1960s and 1970s, display Brutalist and modernist architecture that influenced Belgian academic architectural styles.														
Bosnia Herzegovina	Memorial park Vraca, Sarajevo (1981); National park and memorial complex i Tjentište (1971,1975); National park and memorial complex Kozara (1972); Sport, commercial and cultural centre Skenderija, Sarajevo (1969); Memorial complex Partizansko groblje, Mostar (1965)								2	2	1				
Brazil	2024 - Terreiro Ilê Axé Icimimó Aganju Didê (BA) - place of african matrix religion 2021 - Conjunto Tecelagem Parahyba (SP), diversos prédios de 1925 a 1966 - Inclui a Residência Olivo Gomes(1951), Galpão para Máquinas (1957), complexo da Usina de Leite (1963) e Hangar para Aviões (1965), projetados por Rino Levi, a Residência projetada por Carlos Millan (1951) e o paisagismo da Residência Olivo Gomes, de autoria de Roberto Burle Marx (1966) - industrial heritage						3	2							
Bulgaria	Two urban ensembles in Dimitrovgrad, built in 1950s, listed in 2009, approx. age 50 years						2	1		1					

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	Airport near the Ruse, built in 1960s, listed in 2024, approx. age 60 years Memorial complex Founders of the Bulgarian State, near Shumen, built in 1981, listed in 2020, approx. age 40 years Monument on Mt. Buzludzha, built in 1981, listed in 2021, approx. age 40 years These are the only post-war examples listed in Bulgaria.														
Canada	1. Christ-Roi Cathedral, 11 Rue de la Cathedrale, Gaspé, QC G4X 2V9 Canada, built in 1968-1969, listed in 2012 by the government of Quebec. 2. Habitat 67, 2600 Av Pierre-Dupuy, Montréal, QC H3C 3R6 Canada, built in 1967, listed in 2009 by the government of Quebec. 3. Saint-Maurice-de-Duvernay’s Church, Rue d'Ivry, Laval, QC H7G 1S9 Canada, built in 1961, by architect Roger d'Astous, listed by the government of Quebec in 2023. 4. Campus-Notre-Dame-de-Foy heritage site, 5000 Rue Clément Lockquell, Saint-Augustin-de-Desmaures, QC G3A 1B3 Canada, built in 1963-1965, listed in 2016 by the government of Quebec. 5. Charles-Daudelin House, 17166, chemin Sainte-Marie, Kirkland, QC H9J 2K9 Canada, built in 1951, then modified and extended several times, and incorporating an artist's studio built in 1986, listed in 2023 by the government of Quebec. Please note that these are examples only from the Province of Québec.							1	4						
Chile	Railway stations														1

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	Sites of memory where torture took place during the military dictatorship.														
China	The following five are the most recent of the only lists supported by legislation - the National Conservation Units. Other lists are younger. For example, among the 766,722 immovable cultural relics registered in the third census, there are a number of 21st century cultural relics. a. Song Qingling Children's Science and Technology Museum, Beijing, built in 1986 and announced in 2019 as the eighth batch of national key cultural relics protection units; b. Monument to the Opening of the Sichuan-Tibet and Qinghai-Tibet Highways, Lhasa, in the Tibet Autonomous Region , Built in 1984 and announced in 2019 as the eighth batch of national key cultural relics protection units; c. Qifeng aqueduct, Lu County, Sichuan Province, built in 1975-1978, announced in 2019 as the eighth batch of national key cultural relics protection units; d . ' February 7th' Memorial Pagoda, Zhengzhou City, Henan Province, built in 1971, announced in 2006 as the sixth batch of national key cultural relics protection units ; e . Zhengzhou Second Grinding Wheel Factory, Zhengzhou City, Henan Province, built in 1964, announced in 2019 as the eighth batch of national key cultural relics protection units.								1	2	2				

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country? How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
Colombia	2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Costa Rica	There is only one listed site: Name of the group of buildings: Known as the "Antigua Zona Americana de Quepos" Address: Finca No. 164409-000 Construction date: 1940s Author: Compañía Bananera de Costa Rica (CBCR) Date of listing for protection: October 12, 2012 Another listing exists under the State Natural Heritage Regime, carried out by the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE): Date of listing: June 3, 2009					1						1				
Croatia	1 Minka Jurković, Marijan Haberle, Eugen Erlich, Tatjana Zdvoržak, Concert Hall Vatroslav Lisinski (built 1960-1973) 2. Aleksandar Dragomanović, Department Store Na-Ma Trnsko, Zagreb (built 1964-1966) 3Ivan Vitić, Building of the Central Committee of the Union of Communists of Croatia, Zagreb (built 1963-1968) 4 Boris Magaš, City stadium Poljud (built 1979)								3	1						
Cyprus	- Diogenous Residence, Nicosia, built: 1969-1970, listed: 2023 (age 54) - Plant nursery (Fytorio), Nicosia, built: 1968, listed: 2011 (age 43)								5							

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020		
	- Neoptolemos Michaelides Residence, Nicosia, built: 1964-1966, listed: 2011 (age 45) - Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance, Nicosia, built: 1962-1966, listed 2023 (age 57) - Nicosia Retail Market, Nicosia, built: 1965, listed: 2011 (age 46) The Department of Town Planning and Housing has scheduled within 2024 the issuance of Preservation Orders for buildings built from 1970 onwards.															
Czech Republic	ČKD administrative building, Prague, Na Můstku Street, 1976–1983, date of listing 1992; New Scene of National Theatre, Prague, Národní třída, date of listing 2021; Máj Department Store, Prague, Národní třída, 1971–1975, date of listing 2007; Kotva Department Store, Prague, Revoluční třída, 1964–1974, date of listing 2019; Federal Assembly, Prague, Wilsonova Street, 1966–1974, date of listing 2000								2	2						
Denmark	Kildeskovshallen (architects Karen & Ebbe Clemmensen), Adolfsvej 25, 2870 Gentofte, constructed in 1972, listed in 2000. Uglegårdsskolen (architects Halldor Gunnløgsson & Jørn Nielsen), Tingsryds Allé 25, 2680 Solrød, constructed in 1974, listed in 2015. Publisher House (architect Erik Korshagen), Skindergade 5, 1159 København, constructed in 1976, listed in 1992.									1	3	1				

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	Kalundborghallerne (architects Friis & Moltke and landscape architect Sven Hansen), J. Hagemann-Petersens Allé 11, 4400 Kalundborg, constructed in 1977, listed in 2013. The National Bank of Denmark incl. wedge-shaped pavement towards Havnegade (architect Arne Jacobsen), Havnegade 5, 1093 København K, constructed in 1965-1978, listed in 2009. Trinitatis Church Square (architects Sven-Ingvar Andersson & Steen Høyer, Inger & Johannes Exner), Købmagergade 52, 1150 København K, constructed in 1984, listed in 2020. Paustians Hus (architect Jørn Utzon), Kalkbrænderiløbskaj 2, 2100 København Ø, constructed in 1987 (addition in 2010 by Kim Utzon), listed in 2012. Villa with carport (architect Tage Lyneborg), Lyngskrænten 5, 2840 Holte, constructed in 1987, listed in 2022. Nybrovej 116 (KHR architects, the three connected office buildings with green surroundings), Nybrovej 116, 2800 Kongens Lyngby, constructed in 1994 (extended in 2000, 2005), listed in 2015.														
Dominican Republic	The youngest 20th century heritage sites that have been included in the inventory and registry and have been protected are those that correspond to the Peace and Brotherhood Fair of the Free World, called the Center of Heroes, in the City of Santo Domingo (National District). Its construction dates from 1955 to 1959. The first resolution declaring it Dominican heritage is the Executive Decree n. 66/04, from 2004. It was 48 years old. They were declared Monumental Heritage and their recovery was declared of high national interest, so that the same decree created a Board of Trustees for its conservation, but it is not active.								1						

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020		
Estonia	National Library, Tallinn https://register.muinas.ee/public.php?menuID=monument&action=view&id=30932 1985-1993; listed 2017 Paide Cultrural Center 1987, listed 2016 https://register.muinas.ee/public.php?menuID=monument&action=view&id=30768 Linnahall 1980, listed 1997 https://register.muinas.ee/public.php?menuID=monument&action=view&id=8781 Ugala Theatre , Viljandi 1981 listed 2014 https://register.muinas.ee/public.php?menuID=monument&action=view&id=30246 Pirita Olympic Centre 1976-1980., listed 1997 https://register.muinas.ee/public.php?menuID=monument&action=view&id=8807									1	4					
Finland	Oulunsalo Town Hall (built 1981, protection 17.12.2014, 33 years), Onnimanni Day care centre (built 1980, protection 7.6.2018, 38 years), House of Culture (built 1958, protected 29.6.1989, 31 years), Vuoksenniska Church (built 1958, protected 25.2.2003, 45 years) Home Economic Teacher Training College (built 1956, protected 8.11.2010, 56 years). In addition to those the Aalto Civic Centre in Seinäjoki (built 1960-1989) was protected 24.10.2005, and the church (built 1960) in 25.2.2003 at the age of 43 years. Among the entity Seinäjoki Theatre (1987) was proteced at the age of 28 years. The listings are referring to the strongest legal protection, in city plans protection of younger sites have been taken place. Those are not that easy															

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020		
	to find, but for example Vuoksenniska church was protected in city plan in 1969 at the age of 11 years. One extreme example from 21st C heritage is sauna building Löyly in Helsinki (built 2016, protected in the city plan 2020).															
France	Maison Lemoine 2 chemin des Plateaux, Floirac, 1994-1998, listed as a historic monument in 2002 (4 years old at the time of listing): https://www.pop.culture.gouv.fr/notice/merimee/PA33000068?base=%5B%22Patrimoine%20architectural%20%28M%C3%A9rim%C3%A9e%29%22%5D&periode=%5B%224e%20quart%2020e%20si%C3%A8cle%22%5D&producteur=%5B%22Monuments%20Historiques%22%5D&last_view=%22list%22&idQuery=%22b525f66-b85b-3b2b-3ed4-5bd288f648%22 Journal L'Humanité headquarters 32 rue Jean-Jaurès, Saint-Denis, 1987-?, listed in 2007 (20 years) : https://www.pop.culture.gouv.fr/notice/merimee/PA93000025?base=%5B%22Patrimoine%20architectural%20%28M%C3%A9rim%C3%A9e%29%22%5D&periode=%5B%224e%20quart%2020e%20si%C3%A8cle%22%5D&producteur=%5B%22Monuments%20Historiques%22%5D									1	3	1				

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	D&last_view=%22list%22&idQuery=%22172e713-c5f5-fead-00c3-a2b4d26dd6b0%22 The Tower of Figures, by Jean Dubuffet 170 quai Stalingrad, Issy-les-Moulineaux, 1985, listed in 2008 (23 years old): https://www.pop.culture.gouv.fr/notice/merimee/PA00088178?base=%5B%22Patrimoine%20architectural%20%28M%C3%A9rim%C3%A9e%29%22%5D&periode=%5B%224e%20qu Maison bulles by Daniel Bord Located in Festes-et-Saint-André, 1984-1994, listed in 2023 (29 years old):https://www.pop.culture.gouv.fr/notice/merimee/PA11000064?base=%5B%22Patrimoine%20architectural%20%28M%C3%A9rim%C3%A9e%29%22%5D&periode=%5B%224e%20quart%2020e%20si%C3%A8cle%22%5D&producteur=%5B%22Monuments%20Historiques%22%5 D&last_view=%22list%22&idQuery=%22fae3fb-3f06-f817-c0a5-55c03433ebb%22 Maison Auriol, 10 route de l'Etang, Gabaston, 1979-1981, listed in 2022 (41 years old):https://www.pop.culture.gouv.fr/notice/merimee/PA64000113?base=%5B%22Patrimoine%22%5														

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020		
	20architectural%20%28M%C3%A9rim%C3%A9e%29%22%5D&periode=%5B%224e%20quart %2020e%20si%C3%A8cle%22%5D&producteur=%5B%22Monuments%20Historiques%22%5 D&last_view=%22list%22&idQuery=%22bbed0-720b-675b-0ac0-4e85b546a6aa%22 Source : Base Mérimée															
Germany	Due to the federal system it is not possible to name the five youngest in the whole country. In general, there are listed buildings dating from the 1980s and 1990s which where about 20 to 40 years old when they were inscribed.															1
Greece	There is no 20th-century list that the Ministry of Culture recognizes. Eero Saarinen's International Airport terminal at the old airport may be listed.															
Hungary	Bak Cultural Center (WGS84 N 16° 50.715'; E 46° 43.815'; EOVS 481697 156366) Constr: 1988, Listing: 2017 Paks Roman Catholic Church (WGS84 N 18° 50.927'; E 46° 36.779' ; EOVS 634781 140976) Constr: 1988, Listing: 2013 Sárospatak Cultural Center (WGS84 N 21° 34.008'; E 48° 19.318' ; EOVS 836832 333968) Constr: 1983, Listing: 2013 ...										3					
Iceland	Litlabæjarvör 4, Álfanesi Built 1983 , listed 2021. Skálholtsskóli built 1970, listed 2012. Menntaskólinn við Hamrahlíð built 1966, listed 2008.								3	1	1					

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		- 1900	- 1910	- 1920	- 1930	- 1940	- 1950	- 1960	- 1970	- 1980	- 1990	- 2000	- 2010	- 2020	
	Norræna húsið built 1966, listed 2004. Hótel Holt (interior) built 1965, listed 2012.														
India	Sr. No. Name and Address of Heritage Place Date of Construction Date of Listing/ Inscription Age when Listed/ Inscribed 1 Bahá'í House of Worship at New Delhi (on TL); Address: Bahapur, New Delhi, Delhi; Date of Construction(inauguration) - 1986; Date of Listing/ Inscription - 2014; Age when Listed/ Inscribed - 28 years. 2 The Architectural Work of Le Corbusier, an Outstanding Contribution to the Modern Movement (on WHL); Address: Capitol Complex, Chandigarh, Union Territory of Chandigarh; Date of Construction -1952-1970s; Date of Listing/ Inscription: 2006 (TL), 2016 (WHL); Age when Listed/ Inscribed: 40-50 years. 3 Santiniketan (on WHL); Address: Birbhum, West Bengal; Date of Construction -Around 1920: Date of Listing/ Inscription: 2008 (TL), 2023 (WHL); Age when Listed/ Inscribed: 80-90 years. 4 Sites of Satyagrah, India's non-violent freedom movement (on TL); Address: A serial nomination that includes 22 sites spread all over the country; Date of Construction: 1915 – 1947; Date of Listing/ Inscription: 2014; Age when Listed/ Inscribed: 67-100 years. 5 New Delhi (on TL, as part of “Delhi – A Heritage City”); Address: New Delhi, Delhi; Date of Construction:1912-1929; Date of Listing/ Inscription: 2012; Age when Listed/ Inscribed: 70-100 years.				2		1			1	1				
Iran	Contempoaray Art Museum, DoC: 1978 Carpet Museum, DoC: 1978									1	2		2		

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	The Sacred Defense Event Places, 1980-1989 Cultural Heritage Organization Building, DoC: 1989 Academy of Art Building, DOC: 2002 The Cemetary of 7th Tir and *th Shahrivar Martyrs, DOC: 2004														
Ireland	a. Former Central Bank of Ireland, Dublin built c.1979 (Protected 2022) b. Hardiman Library, NUIG, Galway built c.1973 (Protected prior to 2012) c. Lisneys, 24 St Stephens Green, Dublin built c.1973 (Protected 2020) d. Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, Dublin built c.1971 (Protected 2020) e. RTE Radio Centre, Dublin built c.1971 (Protected 2022)									5					
Israel	1970s brutalist and structuralist buildings - we are not sure which ones are already listed														1
Italy	The youngest Twentieth-century building listed in Italy is: Sergio Musmeci, Bridge on the river Basento in Potenza, built in 1976 and listed in 2003									1					
Japan	Five young buildings designated most recently as important national cultural property and registered cultural property (buildings). Important Cultural Property-Buildings (Building name, address, year of completion, year of designation/registration): 1. Yoyogi National Gymnasium (First and Second Gymnasium), 2-1 Jinnan, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo, 1964, 2021							3	2						

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	2. Wakamatsu Bridge, 2 Kawashiro, Tobata-ku to 1 Honmachi, Wakamatsu-ku, Kitakyushu City, Fukuoka Prefecture, 1962, 2022 3. National Museum of Western Art Main Building, 7-7 Ueno Park, Taito-ku, Tokyo, 1959, 2005 4. Meiji Shrine (Main Hall, Inner Worship Hall, Norito Hall, Inner Courtyard Corridor, Outer Worship Hall, Divine Storehouse, Inner Perimeter Wall and North Gate, Ritual Food Storehouse and Corridor, Former Ritual Instrument Storehouse, Outer Perimeter Wall, Outer Courtyard Corridor), Yoyogi Kamizono-cho, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo, 1958, 2020 5. Kagawa Prefectural Government Office Former Main Building and East Building, 4-1-3 Banchō, Takamatsu City, Kagawa Prefecture, 1958, 2021 6. Hizuchi Elementary School (East and Central School Buildings), 851 Hitotsu, Yawatahama City, Ehime Prefecture, 1958, 2012 List of Registered Tangible Cultural Properties-Buildings (Building name, address, year of completion): 1. Kato Gakuen Gyoshu Elementary School Main Building, 348-2 Okanomiya, Numazu City, 1972, 2024 2. Hinoki Pharmaceuticals Co., Ltd. Rusutsu Mountain Lodge, 645 Izumikawa, Rusutsu Village, 1972, 2024 3. Ibara Civic Hall Main Building, 311-1 Ibara-cho, Ibara City, 1971, 2023 4. Ibara Civic Hall Annex, 311-1 Ibara-cho, Ibara City, 1971, 2023 5. Blue Box House, 95-1 and others, Kaminoge 2-chome, Setagaya-ku, 1971, 2024														

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020		
Jordan	It is difficult to remember of hand, but I would say in Amman, they include: - Al Hussein Mosque in Downtown Amman (1923) - Hijaz Railroad Station of Amman (1903-4) - The 10 Bridges of the Hijaz Railroad Line (1902-03) - CMS School for Girls (1926-7) - Old Post Office Building on Faisal Street (now called Diwan Duke) (1927) - Amman Electricity Hangar (1936) In the City of As-Salt, they include - The Small Mosque (1906) - Abu Jaber House (Late 19th – Early 20th Century) - Church of the Good Shepperd and the English Hospital (Late 19th and Early 20th Centuries)		1		3	1										
Lithuania	1. Bank “Hermis”, Jogailos st. 9, Vilnius. Built in 1996, listed in 2016. (20 years) 2. Mykolas Žiliskas Art Gallery, Nepriklausomybės sq. 12, Kaunas. Built in 1988, listed in 2020. (32 years) 3. Kaunas IX Fort Museum and Sculptural Group, Žemaičių pl. Kaunas. Built in 1984, sculptural group listed in 1984, museum - in 2016. (monument listed, then built in the register of the Lithuanian SSR, in 1993 transferred to National Register of Lithuanian Republic; museum listed after 32 years) 4. Hotel “Pušynas”, Taikos st. 6, Druskininkai. Built in 1983, listed in 2021. (38 years)										4	1				

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country? How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a
	5. Parliament Complex in Vilnius, Gedimino pr. 53, Vilnius. Built in 1982, listed in 1984. (Listed after 2 years in the register of the Lithuanian SSR, in 1993 transferred to National Register of Lithuanian Republic)															
Malaysia	1. Pasar Seni Jalan Hang Kasturi, Kuala Lumpur, 1937, 29/7/2011 2. Pustaka Peringatan P. Ramlee Setapak, Kuala Lumpur, 1986, 24/7/1986 3. Rumah Persekutuan Jalan Sultan Hishamuddin, Kuala Lumpur, 1954, 27/4/2009 4. Stadium Negara Jalan Stadium, Kuala Lumpur, 1962, 31/12/2005 5. Stesen Keretapi Johor Bahru Jalan Tun Abdul Razak, 80000 Johor Bahru, 1932, 28/12/2015					2		1	1		1					
Mexico	There is no information on the declarations made by the Federal Government, the 'National Catalogue of Works of Artistic Interest' of the INBAL is in permanent evolution.															1
Moldova	- The Chisinau State Circus, architect Alla Kirichenko, s. Shoikhet, 1981. listed in 2022 - Hotel National, Chisinau, architect A. Gorbuntsov and V. Shalaginov, 1974) (voted unanimously to be included in the list by the CNMI (National Council of Historic Monuments) in 2022)									1	1					
Morocco	Tit-Méllil aeronautical station, Garage Palace Auto building, Fiat garage, Cité ouvrière Socica,															1

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	Terrain Vélodrome														
Nepal	Non														1
New Zealand	The following are an example of some of the youngest buildings identified by Heritage New Zealand (which is not the same as statutory protection under New Zealand District Plan legislation). However, it is representational of the younger heritage: Buck House by Ian Athfield, Hawkes Bay (1980) McCoy & Wixon, Hocken Building, University of Otago, Dunedin (1975-79) Brake House by Ron Sang, Titirangi, Auckland (1976-77) Whakatane Airport Terminal by Roger Walker, Whakatane (1974) Alington House by Bill Alington Wellington (1961-62)								1	3	1				
Nigeria	Old Secretariat, Marina, Lagos State (Year of Completion -1895; Year of Listing-1982). Old Katsina Training College, Katsina State (Year of Completion- 1921; Year of Listing- 1959). Steel foot Bridge, Built by Lord Lugard, Kaduna State (Year of Completion- 1904; Year of Listing- 1956). Relics of the Steamer “Dayspring” at Jebba Station, Kwara State (Year of Completion- circa late 19th century; Year of Listing- 1957). First Mining Beacon, Tilden Fulani, Bauchi State (Year of Completion- 1905; Year of Listing- 1956).	1	2	1											

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country? How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
North Macedonia	1. "The building of the new post office in Skopje", built between 1979-81 and protected in 2021 2. „The building of the railway station in Skopje“, built in 1975 and protected in 1981 3. "Monumental Jewish cemetery complex in Bitola“, built in 1963 and protected in 1978 4. "The object of the city hospital in Skopje", built in 1931 and protected in 1963. 5. "The monument to fallen soldiers on Ilindenska Alley in Skopje", built 1955 and protected in 1968					1	1	1	1	1						
Norway	I'm not sure how to obtain this data but it may be available through Geo-Norge or similar.															1
Philippines	The five 20th century structures included in the list of National Cultural Treasures are, from youngest to oldest: 1. Philippine International Convention Center (National Artist Leandro Locsin, architect), PICC Complex, Pasay City, Metro Manila, built 1976 2. Santo Domingo Church (National Artist Jose Zaragoza, architect), Quezon Avenue, Quezon City, Metro Manila, built 1954 3. Far Eastern University (National Artist Pablo Antonio, architect), Nicanor Reyes Street, Sampaloc, Manila, built 1940 4. Metropolitan Theater (Juan Arellano, architect), Padre Burgos Avenue, Ermita, Manila, built 1931			1	1	1	1		1							

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020		
	5. Philippine Normal School (William Parsons, architect), Taft Avenue, Ermita, Manila, built 1912															
Poland	Biały Bór - Greek Catholic church, designed by Jerzy Nowosielski and Bogdan Kotarba, 1997, recognized as a monument in 2019. Warsaw - Central Station, designed by Arseniusz Romanowicz, 1972 - 1975, recognized as a monument in 2019. Rybnik - "Okraślak" - office building, designed by Barbara Meisel, Norbert Warnecki, 1974. Recognition as a monument 2023.. Wrocław - Pavilion "Panorama Racławicka", design 1958, Marek and Ewa Dziekońscy - implementation 1985. Recognition as a monument 1991. Kraków - "Cracovia" Hotel, design Witold Cęckiewicz, 1960, implementation 1965, Recognition as a monument 2016. Note - At 2023 there was an attempt to recognize as a monument, a private chapel from 2011, built in Tarnów near Warsaw, but the decision was overturned due to the lack of features of "testimony of a bygone era". The chapel has not become a monument and is demolished. Does not exist.								1	2	1	1				
Portugal	• Centro Cultural de Belém (Belám Cultural Centre). Construction Date: 1992. Listing Decree: Ordinance n. 5/2002, 19–02. Years from construction to listing: 10. (Architects:Vittorio Gregotti, Manuel Salgado) • Pavilhão de Portugal (Portuguese Pavilion). Construction Date: 1998. Listing Decree: Ordinance n. 240/2010, 30–03. Years from construction to listing: 12. (Architect: Álvaro Siza). • Casal de Santa Maria: conjunto edificado e zona envolvente (Casal de Santa Maria: built ensemble and sorrounding área) – includes Serralves											5				

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
	Museum of Contemporary Art. Construction date: 1999. Listing Decree: Decree-Law n. 31-G/2012, 31–12. Years from construction to listing: 13. (Architect: Álvaro Siza). • Igreja de Santa Maria, paroquial de Fornos, e complexo paroquial (Santa Maria Church, Fornos Parish and Parish Complex). Construction date: 1996. Listing Decree: Ordinance n. 288/2013, 14–05. Years from construction to listing: 17. (Architect: Álvaro Siza). • Palacete do Visconde de Vilar de Allen, jardins e auditório (Palace of the Vilar de Allen Viscount, gardens and auditorium) – includes the Casa das Artes (House of the Arts). Construction date: 1991. Listing decree: Ordinance n. 192/2012, 03-05. Years from construction to listing: 21. (Architect: Eduardo Souto de Moura).														
Romania	- "H" Exhibition Pavillion, Herastrau Parc, Bucharest, 1950, the architects Gustav Gusti, Harry Stern and Ascanio Damian and the engineer E. Şiţariu; listed in 2010 - The State Circus, Bucharest, 1960-1963, architects Nicolae Porumbescu (project manager), Constantin Rulea, Sanda Bercovici, Nicolae Pruncu; listed in 2010 - Palace of Telephones, Cluj-Napoca, architect Vasile Mitrea. 1969-1974) (voted unanimously by the CNMI in 2019)							1	1	1					
Russian Federation	Presently can name only for Moscow (by orders of the Moscow Department of Cultural Heritage): “The Grave of Valeriy Kubasov (1935-2014), twice USSR Hero-cosmonaut”. Moscow, Troekourov Cemetery, Ryabinovaya st., 24. Presumably, the date		3					1						1	

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	of the tombstone installation is 2016. Listed 18 June 2024. Regional object of cultural heritage. 8 years old. “Apartment House”, 1898-1901, arch. E.K. Nirnzee. Moscow, Zemlyanoi Val, 7. Listed 15 August 2023. Regional object of cultural heritage. 122 years old “M.A. Maltsev Apartment House”, 1905, arch. N.N. Zherikhov. Moscow, Novaya Basmannaya st., 28, building 1. Listed 15 August 2023. Regional object of cultural heritage. 118 years old. “The water tower of the main factory building of the Yokish Cloth Manufactory Association”, 1908, arch. D.P. Sukhov. Moscow, Mikhalkovskaya st., 48, building 2. Listed 30 December 2022. Regional object of cultural heritage. 114 years old “Collective farm House of Culture at VDNKH”, 1954, arch. L.N. Avdotyin, Yu.P. Korneev, V.I. Koparin. Moscow, Prospekt Mira, possession 119, building 84. Listed 24 August 2022. Regional object of cultural heritage. 68 years old.														
Saudi Arabia	jeddah Hajj terminal, water towers, Dammam no 7 , Dhahran Airport terminal, Hamra Royal palace														1
Serbia	The youngest example for which the listing process started almost immediately after the completion of the project is the residential complex Cerak-Vinogradi by architects Milenija and Darko Marusic built from the late 1970s-1988. Although the listing dossiers dates back to the mid-2000s, the complex was official listed as a "Cultural and Historical Area" not a single "Cultural Monument" in 2019. Another accomplishment is the protection of vast area named the Central zone of New Belgrade, which development started as a variation on the Radiant City with a more ambitious goal. It									1					

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country? How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	intended similarly to Brasilia to become a new national capital. The area was listed in 2021.															
Singapore	1. Golden Mile Complex (5001 Beach Road, S199588), completed in 1974, listed in 2022 2. Jurong Town Hall (9 Jurong Town Hall Road, S609431), completed in 1974, listed in 2005, gazetted as National Monument in 2015 3. Old Subordinate Courts (3 Havelock Square, S059725), completed in 1975, listed in 2013 4. Singapore Conference Hall and Trades Union House (7 Shenton Way, S068810), completed in 1965, gazetted as National Monument in 2010. 5. Toa Payoh Town Park Observation Tower (Lor 6 Toa Payoh, S319393), completed in 1972, listed in 2009								1	4						
Slovenia	1) ID: 1-26716, Name: Teharje Memorial Park, Date built: first quarter of the 21st century, 2004 Date Listed: 9.6.2008, Age at the entry to the register: 4 2) ID: 1-14291 Name: Srebrniče Cemetery Address: Srebrniče 1a, Novo mesto Date built: turn of the 20th century and 21st century, 1998-2000											1	3	1		

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	Date Listed: 6.2.2006														
	Age at the entry to the register: 6														
	3) ID: 1-09824														
	Name: Chapel of St Barbara														
	Address: Trobni Dol 41, Šentrupert														
	Date built: last quarter of the 20th century, 1993														
	Date Listed: 9.11.1998														
	Age at the entry to the register: 5														
	4) ID: 1-14289														
	Name: Farmadent														
	Address: Minařikova ulica 6, Maribor														
	Date built: last quarter of the 20th century, 1993-1995														
	Date Listed: 1.12.2004														
	Age at the entry to the register: 11														
	4) ID: 1-04158														
	Name: Church of the Incarnation of Christ in Dravljje														
	Address: Vodnikova cesta 256a Ljubljana														
	Date built: zadnja četrtina 20. stol., 1985 last quarter of the 20th century, 1985														
	Date Listed: 30.4.1996														

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020		
	Age at the entry to the register: 11															
South Africa	I don't have this information to hand															1
Spain	The building of the Institute of Cultural Heritage of Spain, designed by architects Fernando Higuera and Antonio Miró, located in the University City of Madrid, was built between 1966 and 1985, and was declared a World Heritage Site in 2001, 16 years after its completion.								1							
Sweden	Nora Parish House 1997, listed 2005, Kungsgatan 12, 713 31 Nora. Ralph Erskines home 1963, listed 2006, Ekuddsvägen 42, 178 34 Ekerö. Skålan Gas station 1953, listed 2000, Klövsjö. Eriksberg gantry crane 1969, listed 2012, Monsungatan, 417 65 Göteborg. Vill Norrköping 1963, listed 2001, Nordengatan 15, 60382 Norrköping.							1	3			1				
Thailand	Krung Thon Bridge Date of construction: 1957 Date of listing: 2023							1								
The Netherlands	No, there are no legal criteria that prevent listing of 20C heritage as such, but there have been recent quantitative restrictions for new additions to the national monuments register (two times 100) as well as the qualitative requirement of a 'Top' monument, due to imposed instructions from the Ministry of Culture (although there is no grading system in our country, like in the United Kingdom) – see reply sub 3 in this section. In addition, also a positive perspective for future use was required. The following national monuments are completed in 1966 or 1967 (all non-residential):								5							

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020		
	- Hooglandgemaal, Stavoren mno 532138 (registered 2015) - Aula TH, Delft mno 532250 (2015) - Doelen, Rotterdam mno 532212 (2016) - Sportcentrum, Breda mno 532193 (2018) - Evoluon, Eindhoven mno 532277 (2018) - Waterloopbos, Marknesse mno 532192 (2016) (evolved 1954-1990)															
Tunisia	- The headquarters of the Tunis transport company - Ministry of Finance headquarters, Place de la Kasbah, Tunis - Dar Chnik villa and garden, Radès, built in the 20th century during the 40s, - Former Sejnan railway station, Bizerte - Remains of the Mareth fortified defensive line, Gabès These heritage sites were inscribed in 2023						1									
Turkey	B2 House, Çanakkale, architect Han Tümertekin & Mimarlar (designed in 1999, completed in 2001, listed in 2017 at 16 years) Anıtkabir- Mausoleum of Atatürk, Ankara, architects Emin Onat & Orhan Arda (designed in 1941, completed in 1953, listed in 1978 at 25 years) Milli Reasürans Building, İstanbul, architects Şaziment & Neşet Arolat (designed in 1985, completed in 1987, listed in 2011 at 26 years) Sevda-Cenap And House, Ankara, architect Emin Onat (designed in 1952, listed in 1976 at 26 years)							2	1		1	1				

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a
		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	Zeyrek Social Security Complex, Istanbul, architect Sedad Hakkı Eldem (designed in 1962, completed in 1970, listed in 2002 at 32 years) Two other places may be included in the list since they are listed at a young age. However, the State Cemetery disrupted the layout and integrity of an important earlier site, Atatürk Forest Farm, designed by Hermann Jansen (planner), Ernst Egli (architect) in 1925-1938. Meanwhile, The Miners' Monument was not designated on its individual architectural/artistic merit but as an item on a list of sculptural monuments designed in the last decades of the 20C. State Cemetery, Ankara, architect Özgür Ecevit & Ekrem Gürenli (designed in 1982, completed in 1987, listed in 1992 at 5 years) Miners' Monument, Ankara, sculptor Metin Yurdanur (completed in 1991, listed in 1997 at 6 years)														
United Kingdom	n/a														1
United States of America	Vanna Venturi House (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) - Completed in 1964 and listed in 2016 TWA Flight Center (New York City, New York) - Designed by Eero Saarinen and completed in 1962, it was listed in 2005 North Christian Church (Columbus, Indiana) - Designed by Eero Saarinen and completed in 1964, it was listed in 2000 Welcome to Fabulous Las Vegas Sign (Las Vegas, Nevada) - Installed in 1959 and listed in 2009 Marin County Civic Center (San Rafael, California) - Designed by Frank Lloyd Wright and completed in 1962, it was listed in 1991								4	1					

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?		1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available		1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	AT&T Building (e.g. Sony Plaza or 550 Madison Avenue), completed in 1984 by Philip Johnson and Joh Burgee – was listed by NYC Landmarks Commission in 2018 The 20th Century Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Inscription in the United States – completed from 1908 – 1959 by Frank Lloyd Wright and listed in 2019 The Eames House (e.g. Case study House No. 8) (Los Angeles, California), completed by Charles and Ray Eames in 1949 – it was designated a National Historic Landmark in 2007 The Schindler House (e.g. Kings Road House) (Los Angeles, California), completed by Rudolph Schindler in 1922 – was listed on the U.S. National Register of Historic Places in 1994 The Farnsworth House (Plano, Illinois), completed by Mies Van Der Rhoe was completed in 1946 and 1951 – it was listed as a landmark by the National Historic Trust in 2006 The Glass House (New Caanan, Connecticut), completed in 1949 by Phillip Johnson was added to the National Register of historic Places in 1977														
Uruguay	Memorial de Recordación de los Detenidos Desaparecidos - 2001 (protection date). National Historic Monument: 2014. Vaz Ferreira Park - Cerro de Montevideo Park														1
Venezuela	The Ciudad Universitaria de Caracas was declared a National Historic Monument on April 15, 1994, after the completion of the major works of the project in 1958. However, additional faculties were later built, such as the School of Sanitary Engineering (1972), the School of Industrial Engineering						1								

What are the five youngest Twentieth-century heritage places that have been listed in your country?									1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
How old were they when they were listed? Please include Name, Address, Date of construction and Date of Listing if readily available									1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	
	(1972), the Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences (1985), and the Faculty of Metallurgical Engineering (2000). These buildings are included in both the declaration and the area protected by UNESCO. They were directed by architect Gorka Dorronsoro, although following the design guidelines of architect Carlos Raúl Villanueva, who passed away in 1975.																					
								TOTAL	1	6	2	6	7	3	21	51	36	40	16	3	1	11
									1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	n/a
									-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
									1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020	

Appendix IX: Reference Documents, Guidelines, Best Practices and Standards

<i>Has your country developed reference documents, guidelines and best practice standards focused on the conservation of Twentieth-century heritage places? If so, what are they?</i>	
Abu Dhabi Emirate	- Policy, guidelines, standards and specifications for recording and documenting Abu Dhabi's historic environment (cover modern heritage as well) - Guidelines for conducting structural assessments for modern heritage - Modern Heritage Interventions Manual [planned for 2025] - Modern Heritage Typomorphology Thematic Handbook [planned for 2025]
Algeria	-
Argentina	ICOMOS documents related to heritage conservation in general and documents produced by ISC20C and DOCOMOMO.
Armenia	Not separately for 20th-century heritage, but overall, yes.
Australia	AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS – 2008 HERITAGE POLICY https://www.architecture.com.au/wp-content/uploads/Heritage-Policy.pdf This Policy is being updated by the RAlA National Heritage Committee (16/09/2024) Design in Context guidelines https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/-/media/OEH/Corporate-Site/Documents/Heritage/design-in-context-guidelines-for-infill-development-historic-environment.pdf are general enough as best practice charter; Sustainable Heritage Buildings Guide 2024 https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/research-and-publications/publications-search/sustainable-heritage-buildings-guide The Burra Charter and Practice Notes to Burra Charter; https://australia.icomos.org/publications/burra-charter-practice-notes/ Significance 2.0, written by Roslyn Russell and Kylie Winkworth, was published in 2009 by the Collections Council of Australia, It is a guide to assessing the significance of collection aims to help collecting organisations, collections professionals and the broader public to determine the significance of cultural and heritage objects. Currently under review These are more case studies than general guidance documents : Colonel Light Gardens, Adelaide https://www.environment.sa.gov.au/topics/heritage/state-heritage-areas/colonel-light-gardens Haberfield Heritage Conservation Area https://www.innerwest.nsw.gov.au/develop/heritage-and-conservation/heritage-conservation-areas

Belgium	Belgium's approach refers where possible international standards with a focus on architectural and industrial heritage, e.g. the European guidelines for the conservation of recent heritage.
Bosnia Herzegovina	/
Brazil	No
Bulgaria	No
Canada	No, there isn't a specific reference document for Twentieth-century heritage. The main reference for heritage conservation (including modern heritage but not specific to it) are the "The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada" by Parks Canada: https://www.historicplaces.ca/media/18072/81468-parks-s+g-eng-web2.pdf
Chile	I believe the primary document in this field is the INN NCH3389 standard, as it authorizes and facilitates the regulation of buildings with concrete and masonry structures. Before 2020, such buildings were often subjected to deep interventions to adapt to reinforced concrete's NCh433 standard for seismic-resistant design. This approach deviated significantly from earlier typologies, as NCh433 is primarily aimed at designing new structures that, given modern technology in calculation, material strength, and high-rise construction, are entirely disconnected from past logic. The new standard analyzes actual performance based on usage type, which should result in fewer and more appropriate interventions. However, its weakness lies in the complexity of the analysis and calculations, especially when dealing with modest heritage assets, and the inability to carry out such studies.
China	In the Fourth National Cultural Relics Census Standards, Registration Forms and Recorded Instructions, detailed and specific requirements were made for the identification, classification and registration of modern cultural relics, and a nationwide census of immovable cultural relics were conducted accordingly. In the process of registration of national key cultural relics protection units, the National Cultural Heritage Administration of China has published corresponding guidance documents, in which there are detailed requirements for the identification, classification, protection management and zoning of modern cultural relics. National level: For the whole cultural heritage including the 20th century architectural heritage, the Guidelines for the Conservation of Cultural Relics and Monuments in China were formulated by the Chinese National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in 2002 and recommended by the National Cultural Heritage Administration of China (NCHA) for publication. Notice on Strengthening the Protection of 20th Century Heritage (28 April 2008) by the National Cultural Heritage Administration of China, which proposes to pay full attention to the protection of 20th century heritage, actively explore the theories and methods of protection of 20th century heritage, actively carry out census and assessment of 20th century heritage, effectively carry out the rational

	use of 20th century heritage, and widely publicise and guide the public to pay attention to and participate in the 20th century heritage protection. The Interim Measures for the Management of National Industrial Heritage was issued on 5 November 2018 by the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology of the People's Republic of China. The Measures make clear provisions for carrying out the protection and utilisation of national industrial heritage and related management work in terms of identification procedures, protection and management, utilisation and development, supervision and inspection. Academic group level: The 20th Century Architectural Heritage Committee of the Chinese Society of Cultural Heritage prepared the 'Criteria for the Recognition of China's 20th Century Architectural Heritage (Trial Draft) (August 2014)
Colombia	Research, documentation, specialized bibliography.
Costa Rica	Source: Ofelia Sanou. ARCHITECTURE AND HISTORY IN COSTA RICA: Parish Temples in the Central Valley, Grecia, San Ramón, and Palmares 1860-1914. Editorial of the University of Costa Rica. National Commission of Historical Commemorations, Nueva Historia Collection, 2001. Introduction Chapter, pages 17–27, includes citations and notes. https://editorial.ucr.ac.cr/artef/item/1651-arquitectura-e-historia-en-costa-rica-templos-parroquiales-en-el-valle-central-grecia-san-ramon-y-palmares-1860-1914.html Summary of the Text: "As a precursor to our research, the theoretical-methodological aspects in the historiography of Costa Rican architectural history are based on studies conducted by architects and architecture students, 'primarily after the 1970s (...).' This is followed by analyzing articles published in the Revista Habitar of the College of Architecture (1976–1974). Architectural history books (1970–...) Reflects a significant concern for cultural heritage and its conservation as historical documentation. The theses and seminars at the University of Costa Rica dedicated to the history of architecture can be categorized into three groups: Graduation projects: These evaluate architectural heritage and propose conservation strategies. Seminars on Costa Rican architecture: Covering urban and general history, they aim to construct and preserve documentation for future generations. Seminars dedicated to specific architectural styles: Focused on Victorian and traditional architecture, these propose typological and morphological analysis methods, thoroughly classifying floor plans, house components, and historical contexts (14). Before 1990, most works on the history of architecture needed more critical tools and rigorous use of the historical method. This method is understood as one that posits hypothetical-deductive explanations of regularities, ruptures, and long durations. In 1990, publications and seminars on modern Latin American architecture began flourishing. They proposed new methodological approaches and created categories tailored

to studying Latin American architecture.

In 1997, alongside our research, a project was undertaken to write a comprehensive history of Costa Rican architecture, covering ancient societies to the present, with a multidisciplinary team. This effort led to an exhibition on Costa Rican architecture history and the publication of a book.

Additional Works by Ofelia Sanou:

"Costa Rica in the 20th Century"

Source: Eugenio Rodríguez Vega (Ed.), Costa Rica in the 20th Century, Volume II, EUNED, 2004, pp. 259–317.

<https://books.google.co.cr/books?id=wladNRT1mawC&printsec=frontcover&hl=es-419#v=onepage&q&f=false>

Key Questions Addressed:

Political, social, economic, and cultural determinants of urban and architectural development.

Impact of architectural and technological innovations on cultural and environmental contexts.

Continuities and disruptions in architectural traditions and construction practices.

This study divides Costa Rican architecture into three periods:

1910–1947: The first half of the century.

1948–1979: Post-war growth.

1980–2000: Modern challenges.

"Guide to Architecture and Landscape (2010)"

Published by the College of Architects of Costa Rica, Junta de Andalucía.

Download PDF

Additional Investigations:

Ricardo Chaves: Arte + Técnica de ARTEC (1965–1975).

Research in Repository

Alfredo González: Audiovisual capsules on Costa Rican heritage.

YouTube Channel

Rafael Venegas: Conservation project for UCR's Engineering Faculty.

(No online link provided in the source).

Eugenia Solis: Bioclimatic Analysis of Costa Rican 20th-Century Architecture.

Álvaro Campos Vallejo: History of La Sabana Airport, now the Costa Rican Art Museum.

(Research in progress).

Carlos Jankilevich: Identity, Landscape, and Spatiality at UCR.

Croatia	Not yet.
Cyprus	Some results have been produced by research programs (e.g. CONSECH 20, WP4 Available at https://consech20.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/WP4_UCY_Report_Materials-and-techniques-for-conservation.pdf) but there are no officially published reference documents, guidelines and best practice standards focused on the conservation of Twentieth-century heritage places. Competent authorities, academia, and specialized interest groups all recognize the urgent need to develop reference documents for the conservation of Twentieth-century heritage.
Czech Republic	No.
Denmark	There are only very few specific guidelines for the conservation of 20th-century heritage, but some initiatives have been made: Slots- og Kulturstyrelsen provides a selection of specific building and landscape conservation and management guidelines: https://slks.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/SLKS/Omraader/Kulturarv/Bygningsfredning/Faglige_retningslinjer/16_Udearealer/16.1_Landskabspleje.pdf Real Dania is working with climate issues for housing estates 1930-1974: https://realdania.dk/publikationer/faglige-publikationer/klimavisioner-for-modernismens-bygningskultur Real Dania has performed a demonstration project, maintenance guide, surveys for 1940s and 1950s masonry housing and manuals for 21 prominent residential buildings of this period: https://realdania.dk/projekter/1940erne-og-1950ernes-murede-boligbyggeri Renovation guide: https://realdania.dk/publikationer/faglige-publikationer/renoveringsguide_kvaliteter_udfordringer-og-anbefalinger Building culture and heritage values: https://realdania.dk/publikationer/faglige-publikationer/bygningskultur-og-bevaringsv%C3%A6rdier Dansk Beton ran a series of seminars on why and how to conserve historic concrete: http://teknologihistorie.dk/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/historisk-beton-fyraftensnetvaerk.pdf Slots- og Kulturstyrelsen has made methodological guidance for how to assess and formulate policies of cultural environments (KulturMiljø-Metoden). The method is a recent extension of the SAVE method (Survey of Architectural Values in the Environment), which is the most widely used method for identification and registering buildings worthy of preservation and cultural environments. KulturMiljø-Metoden attempts to link building and landscape registration and is therefore suitable for the 20th century. However, in Denmark there is freedom of choice of method, and there are several methods for assessing heritage values such as SAK, DIVE and VAF. https://slks.dk/omraader/kulturarv/bevaringsvaerdige-bygninger-og-miljoer/bevaringsvaerdige-bygninger-metode/kulturmiljo-metoden
Dominican Republic	At the moment, we do not have an updated Law for the protection and defense of cultural heritage that includes the heritage of the 20th century. We mainly have laws 318-68 and 492-69 and their regulations. In addition, we have surveys and records of heritage property from the 20th century, which give us the power to preserve them by applying these current

	laws, and by resolutions of the Constitutional Court and through decrees of the executive branch.
Estonia	Yes - a series of guidelines for different types of buildings https://www.tallinn.ee/et/ehitus/juhised-miljooaladel
Finland	Various processes by National heritage agency are: maintenance and restoration guidelines at https://www.korjaustaito.fi/ (the good practices set were prepared in the late 1990s, many of those applied to 20th C buildings as well) thematic inventories of the post WW II architecture have been prepared https://www.museovirasto.fi/fi/kulttuuriymparisto/rakennettu-kulttuuriymparisto/rakennettu-hyvintointi Various more local sources are available, but more difficult to trace. Pro Sunila ry at Sunila housing (by Aalto) for example has provided a wide set of guidelines and best practise advice since late 2000s, practices not available in English, but some of the information in English on https://www.alvaraaltosunila.fi/en/frontpage
France	Ministry of Culture circulars to DRACs and prefects
Germany	Yes, examples: Guiding principles for the evaluation of churches built after 1945 https://www.vdl-denkmalpflege.de/fileadmin/dateien/Arbeitsblätter/Nr29.pdf ICOMOS Germany: Konservierung der Moderne? / Conservation of Modern Architecture? Über den Umgang mit den Zeugnissen der Architekturgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts. https://www.icomos.de/data/pdf/xxiv-0421-0913-27.pdf
Greece	No.
Hungary	No special documents on 20thC heritage management.
Iceland	No not that I know of.
India	In general, no reference guidelines or documents have been developed. However, best practice methods are being evolved in conservation of exposed RCC and other experimental constructions.
Iran	Book: Eskandar MOKHTARI TALEGHANI, Modern architectural heritage of Iran, Tehran: Cultural research office 2012 There are some unofficial suggestions
Ireland	Specific guidelines have not been developed however the twentieth-century heritage is referenced throughout the body of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities https://www.buildingsofireland.ie/app/uploads/2019/10/Architectural-

	Heritage-Protection-Guidelines-for-Planning-Authorities-2011.pdf
Israel	The Tel Aviv and Jerusalem municipalities have published some thematic documents with guidelines on 20th Century heritage.
Italy	No.
Japan	No.
Jordan	Unfortunately, my country has not yet developed reference documents, guidelines, and best practice standards focused on the conservation of Twentieth-Century heritage. But, on an individual level, the following had been done by Jordanian firms, and experts: TURATH for Studies and Design had developed for DCT Abu Dhabi (Department of Culture and Tourism of Abu Dhabi) the following documents: A Thematic Study on 20th Century Heritage (Typo-morphological Analysis and Studies) Intervention Guidelines for Modern Heritage in Abu Dhabi. Rami Daher and Sura al Halalsheh of Amman Jordan, had organized in collaboration with the German Jordanian University and ICOMOS Jordan a regional symposium on Modern Heritage in the Arab World (2022). CBRL (Council for British Research in the Levant) Research and documentation of industrial heritage in the Eastern Steppe from the British Mandate Period. Lana Joudeh "Palestine: Spaces and Politics," an introductory curriculum that examines Palestine through a spatial lens. This initiative responds to the growing demand for grounded academic resources on Palestine that provide depth and context beyond immediate colonial destruction. https://palestine.araburbanism.com. Several initiatives/architects had worked on the conservation and adaptive reuse of several 20th century architecture in Amman and in other cities of Jordan. Key examples include: In Amman Darat al Funun (Houses of the Arts) in Amman. The National Gallery of Fine Arts, Amman. Abu Jaber Historic House Museum, As-Salt, Jordan Several adaptive reuse of residential houses from the Modern period by the private sector (Sofra Restaurant in Jabal Amman, Jordan Heritage Restaurant in Jabal Weibdeh, Dar al Anda Gallery in Jabal Weibdeh, Fakhr Al Din Restaurant in Jabal Amman, and many more) Other. TURATH for Studies and Design had worked on various adaptive reuse projects of key 20th century buildings in Jordan including: The Adaptive Reuse of Amman's Electricity Hangar The Adaptive Reuse of a Governmental Building from the early 1950s into a Regional Centre for Conservation and Restoration in Jerash, Jordan. Other.

Lithuania	The legislation system on cultural heritage in Lithuania is based on the Law of Immovable Cultural Heritage, which is not focused directly on any specific type of cultural heritage. The Madrid Document is mostly used for academic purposes, such as teaching students (for example, the Document is extensively analyzed in https://www.arurcohe.com/ , which is a joint master's program between Politecnico di Torino, the University of San Sebastián, and Kaunas University of Technology).
Malaysia	I am not aware.
Mexico	At the request of INBAL a new document has been produced entitled Guía del Patrimonio Artístico Inmueble de México: Comprensión y Preservación has just been written by Dr. Enrique X. de Anda; It will be distributed to interested parties. In all AMEC workshops, the Madrid-Delhi document is used and insisted upon.
Moldova	No.
Morocco	No.
Nepal	No.
New Zealand	No.
Nigeria	No.
North Macedonia	Not yet.
Norway	There are guidance documents at local level and for individual sites and places which cover 20th century heritage properties but not at an overall strategic-level and for the reasons above they typically address post-medieval rather than 20th century heritage.
Philippines	No.
Poland	The position of the Council for the Protection of Monuments at the Minister of Culture and a range of information from professional associations of architects.
Portugal	.
Romania	No.
Russian Federation	The methodology of identification, preservation and conservation of 20th century structures is still in the process of improvement. There are no specially prepared guidelines, editions, or web resources devoted to this problem yet. The experience in this area is reflected in individual publications/articles and expert recommendations. To a certain extent, the detailed books on restoration of the AALTO Library in Vyborg and the NARKOMFIN building in Moscow can serve as a guide to conservation methodology (see Bibliography). The ICOMOS Madrid Document and Madrid New Delhi Document, first published in

	Russian in 2013 and later in 2017 (ISC20C website), assist in building up a better understanding of the conservation goals and strategies thus fulfilling a lacuna of specialized periodicals on 20th century heritage conservation.
Saudi Arabia	No.
Serbia	We still need more preserved and financial support to start a project on a retrospective of our works. We have made a round table of key examples of the reconstruction of modern heritage this year at BINA - Belgrade International Architecture Week. There are a few articles on the construction but nothing on the broader level yet.
Singapore	URA-ICOMOS Singapore Conservation Technical Handbooks < https://www.ura.gov.sg/Corporate/Guidelines/Conservation/Best-Practices > - Most case studies are based on 20th C sites and places in Singapore
Slovenia	No, we are referring to MNDD.
South Africa	I am not aware of any.
Spain	National Plan for the Conservation of 20th Century Heritage. https://www.cultura.gob.es/planes-nacionales/en/dam/jcr:fafab665-7e31-4da9-b897-180d8fd0eb0d/06-maquetado-patrimoniocultural-sxx.pdf Madrid Document. Criteria for the Conservation of 20th Century Architectural Heritage. 2011, Developed by ISC20C in 2011 and approved by Resolution GA 2011/32 of the XVII General Assembly of ICOMOS in Paris as the first step in the process to be finally adopted as a doctrinal text and which was the antecedent of the so-called Madrid-Delhi Document This document was published in three languages. http://aeppas20.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/02-DM-espanol.pdf
Sweden	Not yet.
Thailand	No.
The Netherlands	Yes, there are many reference documents, guidelines, etc. available, though they are not all focused merely on 20C heritage conservation (e.g. Water towers, churches) and the majority is in Dutch. See bibliography and website: - Cultureelerfgoed.nl/Praktijkvoorbeelden herbestemming - series Een Toekomst voor... NB Recently a book is published on post-war construction materials: Somer, K. and Stenvert, R. (eds.), Bouwmaterialen 1940-1990, vernieuwing, constructie, toepassing, Rotterdam 2024
Tunisia	No. Apart from a document drawn up by the ASM and the Municipality of Tunis in 1999,

	"Tunis in the 21st century", but which has no legal basis.
Turkey	No.
United Kingdom	Yes, see above on listing— less on conservation case studies—some projects covered in C20 Magazine.
United States of America	Yes, "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties" https://www.nps.gov/subjects/taxincentives/secretarys-standards-rehabilitation.htm
Uruguay	In addition to those cited in this survey, research and guidelines of international organisations and academic institutions.
Venezuela	Venezuela has ratified the 1972 Convention on World Heritage and the 2023 Convention for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage. The country's legal framework was established in 1993 with the Law for the Protection and Defense of Cultural Heritage, as well as Partial Regulation No. 1 (1994) of the same law. The Law precisely defines the assets that constitute the Republic's cultural heritage, requiring the creation of an inventory to be submitted to the Ministry of Finance and the Comptroller General. It allows for signing international agreements, sets boundaries for interventions on declared or cataloged properties, and grants the authority to halt construction work. The Law covers movable and immovable assets and archaeological and paleontological heritage. However, one limitation is the Institute's unclear legal status for judicial actions against public or private entities, as it is attached to the Ministry of Popular Power for Culture and is not a fully autonomous body. ICOMOS is present in the Institute's Advisory Council. Collaboration has been intermittent, depending on the Institute's management periods. Political changes and general economic difficulties have shifted some priorities.

Appendix X: Publications or Websites

Please provide a short list of publications or websites focused on the conservation of Twentieth-century heritage in your country (national bibliography). We will add these to the bibliography on the ISC20C website	
Algeria	ACHEUK-YOUCHEF M., 2022, Géohistoire architecturale et urbaine de Constantine 1837-1962 : connaître un héritage bâti pour reconnaître un patrimoine. Thèse de Doctorat, Université de Lyon 3 et Université de Constantine 3, 860 p. ACHEUK-YOUCHEF M., 2020, Un SIG historique pour l'historicisation et la connaissance du patrimoine architectural et urbain des XIXème et XXème siècles à Constantine, in BOUHAI N., et AI (dir.), Patrimoines et design d'expérience à l'ère du numérique, Europa, 126 p. ACHEUK-YOUCHEF M., 2019, La saga des « Alessandra » : histoire et oeuvres d'une grande famille de bâtisseurs (architectes, ingénieurs, entrepreneurs et sculpteurs) d'origine italienne à Constantine (1898-1962), in GODOLI E. et SAADAOUI A. (dir.), Architectes, ingénieurs, entrepreneurs et artistes décorateurs italiens au Maghreb, Quaderni del Cedacot-Edizioni ETS, pp. 292-307. ACHEUK-YOUCHEF M., 2018, Historicisation et perspectives patrimoniales d'un héritage architectural et urbain de la période coloniale française (1837-1962) à Constantine. Lettre de l'IRMC (IFRE-USR 3077 CNRS), n°21, p. 11-14. ACHEUK-YOUCHEF M., GAUTHIEZ B., BELABED SAHRAOUI B., 2019, L'héritage architectural et urbain de Constantine pendant la période coloniale française (1837-1962) : un enjeu de connaissance, de conservation et d'identité. Géocarrefour [En ligne], 93/4. ACHEUK-YOUCHEF M., BELABED SAHRAOUI B., 2019, Réalités de l'héritage bâti de la période coloniale française à Constantine : vers un processus de patrimonialisation, in DIRECHE K. (dir.), L'Algérie au Présent, IRMC-Karthala, pp. 469-483.
Argentina	https://issuu.com/icomosargentina/docs/primer_encuentro_-_parte_1 https://issuu.com/icomosargentina/docs/compilaci_n_ii_foro_ http://repositorio.ub.edu.ar/handle/123456789/457 http://repositorio.ub.edu.ar/handle/123456789/704 http://repositorio.ub.edu.ar/handle/123456789/707 https://digital.cic.gba.gob.ar/items/12137b45-1f00-4a20-bed0-73380d9d7fd0 https://cpau.opac.com.ar/pergamo/documento.php?ui=2&recno=22335&id=CPAU.2.22335 https://www.youtube.com/@Monumentos_ar/playlists https://editorial.unc.edu.ar/producto/proyecto-de-conservacion-escuela-superior-de-comercio-manuel-belgrano-1968-2022-ebook/
Australia	The Docomomo Australia register fiches are not a survey, but an excellent collection of information, continually extended by members https://docomomoaustralia.com.au/category/db_bld/ AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS – 2008 HERITAGE POLICY https://www.architecture.com.au/wp-content/uploads/Heritage-Policy.pdf This Policy is being updated by the RAI National Heritage Committee (16/09/2024) These are more case studies than general guidance documents : Design in Context guidelines https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/-/media/OEH/Corporate-Site/Documents/Heritage/design-in-context-guidelines-for-infill-development-historic-environment.pdf are general enough as best practice charter; The Burra Charter and Practice Notes to Burra Charter; https://australia.icomos.org/publications/burra-charter-practice-notes/ Colonel Light Gardens , Adelaide https://www.environment.sa.gov.au/topics/heritage/state-heritage-areas/colonel-light-gardens Haberfield Heritage Conservation Area https://www.innerwest.nsw.gov.au/develop/heritage-and-conservation/heritage-conservation-areas

	Significance 2.0, written by Roslyn Russell and Kylie Winkworth, was published in 2009 by the Collections Council of Australia. It is a guide to assessing the significance of collection aims to help collecting organisations, collections professionals and the broader public to determine the significance of cultural and heritage objects. Currently under review The RAlA notable architecture register listed above This is the national heritage publications list, but It is not focussed on C20: https://www.dcceew.gov.au/parks-heritage/heritage/publications/australian-heritage-database This is the national heritage database. It is not focussed on C20: https://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/ahdb/search.pl Australian historic themes : a framework for use in heritage assessment and management / Australian Heritage Commission was published in 2004 and has been in use for decades in Australia. https://catalogue.nla.gov.au/catalog/880163 The National Thematic Framework was published in 2023 is found at https://www.dcceew.gov.au/parks-heritage/heritage/organisations/australian-heritage-council/publications/ahc-thematic-framework The Framework is a useful document but not widely known; two recent court cases in Qld have highlighted this as a gap , and the Queensland State Heritage branch is currently commissioning a study base on the ISC20C Twentieth Century Thematic Framework. Also preceding the framework is : The Modern Movement in NSW. A Thematic Study and Survey of Places, 2013. and Architectural Heritage in NSW of the Last Quarter of the Twentieth Century 2022. (chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/assets/Uploads/Architectural-Heritage-in-NSW-of-the-Last-Quarter-of-the-Twentieth-Century.PDF)
Belgium	DOCOMOMO Belgium DOCOMOMO (Documentation and Conservation of the Modern Movement) Belgium is a leading organization documenting and promoting the preservation of modernist architecture in Belgium. Their website contains resources, case studies, and publications. Website: https://docomomo.be Heritage Agencies in Belgium (Flanders, Wallonia, and Brussels) Regional heritage agencies regularly publish guidelines and case studies, including efforts focused on 20th-century industrial and modernist architecture. Examples include Flanders Heritage Agency (Agentschap Onroerend Erfgoed) and Walloon Heritage Agency (Agence wallonne du Patrimoine). Websites: Flanders: https://www.onroenderfgoed.be Wallonia: https://www.awap.be Brussels: https://erfgoed.brussels "20th Century Heritage in Belgium" by Pierre Laconte and Pierre Mardaga This publication explores modern architecture and urban planning initiatives in Belgium, offering insights into the challenges of conserving 20th-century heritage. Re-use and Restoration of 20th-Century Architecture (Built Heritage Journal) Articles in Built Heritage highlight Belgian contributions to modernist conservation practices, examining case studies and critical conservation methodologies. Link to related publication: Built Heritage Journal BUILT HERITAGE "Architectural Modernism in Belgium: Between Heritage and Renewal" (2018) Published in collaboration with ICOMOS Belgium, this study provides an overview of Belgium's approach to modernist heritage, including best practices and theoretical frameworks.
Bosnia Herzegovina	www.partizanski.info; https://aabh.ba/kategorija/docomomobh/nasi-projekti/; https://www.icomosubih.ba/Aktivnosti_2020_22_ARHITEKTURA_U_MOM_KVARTU_RUTA_B.html; https://bastina20.ba/sos-moderna/
Brazil	https://cadernos.proarq.fau.ufrj.br/pt/paginas/edicao/38 https://docomomobrasil.com/
Bulgaria	Pre-war Bulgarian modernism - https://foundationbma.org/en/ - Bulgarian Modernist Architecture Foundation - https://independent.academia.edu/LjubinkaStoilova - Ljubinka Stoilova's profile on Academia

	Post-war Bulgarian architecture and urbanism - https://sofiaplan.bg/en/portfolio/new-architectural-heritage-2/ - Initiative for identification, protection and promotion of significant examples of Bulgarian architecture, created after World War II, on municipal level - https://nan.bg/ - New Architectural Heritage Foundation
Canada	https://winnipegarchitecture.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/mod_arch_bib_aug11.pdf https://winnipegarchitecture.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/CMC-Proceedings_Eng_a.pdf https://www.puq.ca/catalogue/livres/sauvegarde-architecture-moderne-1974.html https://www.historicplaces.ca/en/pages/5_modern_heritage-patrimoine_moderne.aspx https://cpcq.gouv.qc.ca/publications/livres-librairie/patrimoine-en-devenir/ https://docomomoquebec.ca/ https://docomomojournal.com/index.php/journal/issue/view/48
Chile	ICOMOS Chile DOCOMOMO Chile Universities (mainly PUC and U of Chile through their architecture faculties) EFE Company (railways): restoration of stations and rehabilitation and improvement of routes Central Government (mainly through the MOP): leveraging restoration projects for buildings Local communities and the defense of their living spaces or old industries that are part of the local dynamics of life (mining, agriculture, and extinct local industries)
China	Luo Xiaowei, edited by Luo Xiaowei, History of Modern Foreign Architecture, China Construction Industry Press, 2004 Lai Delin, Wu Jiang, Xu Subin, editors, History of Modern Chinese Architecture (5 volumes), China Construction Industry Press, 2016 Zhang Compound, Liu Yishi, editors, Research and Conservation of Modern Chinese Architecture (1st to 11th series), Tsinghua University Press, Tianjin People's Publishing House, etc. Xu Subin, edited by Xu Subin, Research on the Protection System of Modern Industrial Heritage in Chinese Cities (5 volumes), China Construction Industry Press, 2021 Liu Kecheng and Ana Tosto Ace (Portugal), Docomomo Modern Architectural Heritage Conservation History and Experience 1988-2012, China Construction Industry Press, 2014. Liu Kecheng, edited by Liu Kecheng, Common Heritage of Different Processes: Proceedings of the 2013 Xi'an International Conference on Architectural Heritage Conservation, China Architecture Industry Press, 2015 Common Heritage: Record of Historical Building Conservation Projects of Shanghai Modern Architecture Design Group, China Architecture Industry Press, 2009 Li Hao, Beijing Urban Planning (1949-1960), China Architecture Industry Press, 2022 Liu Boying, Survey, Research and Protection of China's Industrial Heritage (many series, many years), Tsinghua University Press, 2009 History of Modern Chinese Gardens, edited by Zhu Junzhen, China Construction Industry Press, 2019 20th Century Architectural Heritage Committee of China Society of Cultural Heritage, Annual Report on China's 20th Century Architectural Heritage (2014-2024), Tianjin University Press, 2024 Ma Guoxin and Jin Lei, Outline of China's 20th Century Architectural Heritage, China Construction Industry Press, 2024 State Administration of Cultural Heritage, Interpretation of Cases on Protection and Utilisation of Cultural Relics and Buildings, China Construction Industry Press, 2022 Modern Architectural Conservation by Theodore H.M. Prudon, translated by Yong Xinqun and Cui Ping, Electronic Industry Publishing House, 2015.
Colombia	History of Heritage in Colombia.
Costa Rica	Center for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage MCJ Ministry of Culture and Youth Claudio Vargas Heritage and its Legal Protection. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnpbpcjpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.patrimonio.go.cr/biblioteca_digital/publicaciones/2007/tutela_juridica.pdf Collections: Soto-Maffioli, Sofia, and Venegas Arias, Rafael. National Policy for the Management of State Art Collections 2020-2030. https://issuu.com/museodeartecostarricense/docs/poli_tica_nacional_de_gestio_n_de_colecciones_estata Venegas Arias, Rafael, and Soto-Maffioli, Sofia.

	Management and Conservation of Artworks in State Collections: A Manual for Public Sector Collecting Institutions. https://issuu.com/museodeartecostarricense/docs/gestio_n_y_conservacio_n_de_obras_de_arte_en_col_ecci Venegas Arias, Rafael. List of Public Artworks: Plaque Project for Public Artworks at the University of Costa Rica. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnmbpcajpcgclefindmkaj/https://core.ac.uk/download/489443444.pdf
Cyprus	Books/ booklets: Cypriot Architects Association (2009). Monterno. Archeio, (6), 57–99. Georgiou, C. (2013). British Colonial Architecture in Cyprus. Nicosia: En Tipis Publications. Georgiou, C. (2018). The Architecture of Cypriots During British Rule 1878-1960. Nicosia: En Tipis Publications. Republic of Cyprus, Ministry of Interiors, Department of Town Planning and Housing (2009). European Heritage Days: Learning from the heritage of the modern. Nicosia: Department of Town Planning and Housing, Ministry of Interiors. Journal Articles: Bilsel, N., & Dinçyürek, Ö. (2017). Education Under the Shadow of Politics: School Buildings in Cyprus During the British Colonial Period. <i>Paedagogica Historica</i>, 53(4), 394-410. Daskalaki, G. (2017). 'Aphrodite's Realm': Representations of tourist landscapes in postcolonial Cyprus as symbols of modernization. <i>Architectural Histories</i>, 5(1), 1–16. Fereos, S., & Phokaides, P. (2006). Architecture in Cyprus between the 1930s and 1970s. The search for modern heritage. <i>DOCOMOMO journal</i>, (35), 15–19. Georgiou, A., Georgiou, M., & Ioannou, I. (2022) Seismic Assessment of Historic Concrete Structures: The case of Pedieos Post Office in Nicosia, Cyprus. In <i>Developments in the Built Environment</i>. [Available online at https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666165922000059?via%3Dihub] Phokaides, P., & Pyla, P. (2011). Ambivalent Politics and Modernist Debates in Postcolonial Cyprus. <i>The Journal of Architecture</i>, 16(6), 855–913. Phokaides, P. and Pyla, P. (2016). Leisure-scapes and Conflict-scapes: The Famagusta modern coastline. In: Tostoes, A., and Ferreira, Z., eds. <i>Adaptive reuse: the modern movement towards the future</i>. Lisbon: Docomomo International. Pyla, P. and Phokaides, P. (2009). Virtual Tour: Twentieth-Century Cyprus. <i>EAHN</i>, 2 36–49. Available from https://eahn.org/app/uploads/2016/08/Newsletter_2009-2_lowres.pdf. Sioulas, M., & Pyla, P. (2018). Social Housing in Late Colonial Cyprus: Contestations on Urbanity and Domesticity. In M. Gharipour & K. Kilinc (Eds.), <i>Identity, Nation and Beyond: Social Housing in Contemporary Middle East</i> (pp. 181-206). Indiana University Press. Conference Proceedings: Aydintik, S., Pulhan, H., & Uraz, T. (2016). Adaptive Reuse of Modern School Building in Post-Colonial Cyprus. In: <i>Docomomo 14th international conference proceedings</i> (pp. 607–613). Georgiou, A., Ioannou, I., & Pantazopoulou, S. (2019). Rehabilitation of 20th century concrete heritage buildings: The case study of the municipal market in Nicosia, Cyprus. In <i>SEDEC Earthquake risk and engineering towards a resilient world</i> (Greenwich, London, September 9-10). [Available online at https://www.seced.org.uk/index.php/proceedings/category/60-session-21-seismic-design-and-analysis-timber-masonry-and-heritage] Georgiou, A., Hadjimichael, M., & Ioannou, I. (2021). Conservation of 20th century concrete heritage structures in Cyprus: Research and Practice. In <i>12th International Conference on Structural Analysis of Historical Constructions, SAHC 2021</i> (Barcelona, September). [Available online at https://www.scipedia.com/public/Georgiou_et_al_2021a] Nodaraki, M., Hadjipetrou, T., Aimilios, M., Filokyprou, M., & Pyla, P. (2021). Creating an inventory of Modern Architectural Heritage in Cyprus. In <i>Proceedings of the 5th Biennial of Architectural and Urban Restoration, CICOP Italy</i> (pp. 754-764). Edizioni CICOP Italia. Siandou, E. (2015). Heritage Values and Sustainable Development: The Case of the Modern Heritage in Cyprus. In <i>Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainability in Architectural Cultural Heritage, BIO CULTURAL</i> (Limassol, Cyprus, November 9-14). Websites Docomomo Cyprus (2014). Cyprus 100 [most] important buildings, sites and neighbourhoods. Available online at https://issuu.com/docomomo.cyprus/docs/_importantbuildingsdocomomocy_18_04. Docomomo International (2015). Docomomo Virtual Exhibition: Cyprus. Available online at http://exhibition.docomomo.com/items/browse?search=Cyprus&submit_search=Search DOCOMOMO CYPRUS, "Varosha, Famagusta – Heritage in Danger", November 15, 2020. Available online at https://www.change.org/p/international-community-protect-modern-varosha?utm_content=cl_sharecopy_25866484_en-

	US%3A3&recruiter=54057367&utm_source=share_petition&utm_medium=copylink&utm_campaign=share_petition&fbclid=IwAR2rMRr7Zu80Pw82BRG-6iVJ0IU65kInpGb2Pno9r8OwCN1Nki6SSmsZC0k. Usher application. Available online at https://museumlaboratory.org/cy/usher-application/ .
Czech Republic	https://www.fa.cvut.cz/docomomo/ ; http://www.architektura80.cz/.knihy ; http://www.industrialnitopografie.cz/index2.php ; https://www.npu.cz/cs/e-shop/kategorie#category=8290&publisher=&availabilityFilter=&ebook=&sort=&author=&formId=publicationsFilter&page=1 ; https://www.umprum.cz/cs/web/pro-verejnost/nakladatelstvi/vydane-tituly ; https://www.obecnidumbrno.cz/publikace.html
Denmark	National guidelines (not specifically for 20th century heritage, but includes e.g. concrete): https://slks.dk/omraader/kulturarv/fredede-bygninger/bygningsarbejde-eller-vedligehold/hent-viden-og-vaerktoejer/faglige-retningslinjer National strategy for listing (including a historic thematic framework, focusing on 20th century heritage) https://slks.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/SLKS/Omraader/Kulturarv/Bygningsfredning/Fredede_bygninger/De_t_Saerlige_Bygningssyn_-_Strategi_2022_-_Skaerm.pdf Network for concrete repair and conservation (no specific focus on heritage): https://www.teknologisk.dk/dansk-reparationsnetvaerk-for-betonreparationer-danrep/danrep/39189
Dominican Republic	Cincuenta Años de Gestion del Patrimonio en la República Dominicana. Arquitecto Magazine, n. 123, 2017 -- www.arquitecto.com El Rescate del Patrimonio Documental Dominicano, July 2017 -- https://agn.gob.do/images/phocadownload/Informativo_AGN_enero_-_julio_2017.pdf Patrimonio Cultural del Siglo XX, 2020 --- https://www.researchgate.net Patrimonio Nacional, by Banco Popular Dominicano, 2023 --- https://issuu.com/popularenlinea/docs/libro_patrimonio_2023_-_single El Patrimonio Arquitectónico de Mao. Arquitecto, 2023 --- https://arquitecto.com/2023/08/el-patrimonio-arquitectonico-de-mao/ Viviendas Populares de Salcedo. Arquitecto, 2022 --- https://arquitecto.com/2022/03/viviendas-populares-de-salcedo/ El patrimonio arquitectónico durante el siglo XX. Perspectiva, gestión y cambio, 2022 --- https://prodavinci.com La República Dominicana en los Inicios del siglo XX. Universidad Nacional Pedro Henriquez Ureña, 1995. https://repositorio.unphu.edu.do
Estonia	https://www.arhitektuurimuuseum.ee/est/product-category/raamatud/ Lilian Hansar (Ed) Eesti linnaehituse ajalugu keskajast tsaariaja lõpuni , 2019 Epp Lankots, Triin Ojari (Eds) Eesti linnaehituse ajalugu 1919-2020, 2024 Mart Kalm, Eesti 20. sajandi arhitektuur, 2001 Leele Välja, 100 sammu läbi 20. sajandi Eesti arhitektuuri, 2013 Leele Välja (Ed), Puit Eesti arhitektuuris, 2016 Karin Hallas-Murula ,Tallinn Architecture 1900-2020, 2020 Epp Lankots, Triin Ojari LEISURE SPACES Holidays and Architecture in 20th Century Estonia, https://www.academia.edu/44287244/LEISURE_SPACES_Holidays_and_Architecture_in_20th_Century_Estonia
Finland	www.docomomo.fi (information published Malmberg, Kummala (et.al.) 2017: Docomomo Suomi Kohdevalikoima - Finland Register selection)
France	https://www.culture.gouv.fr/regions/DAC-Martinique/Disiplines-et-secteurs/Architecture-et-Patrimoine/Diffusion-et-valorisation/Label-Patrimoine-du-XXe-siecle https://www.icomosfrance.fr https://www.docomomo.fr/ https://journals.openedition.org/insitu/ https://www.persee.fr https://journals.openedition.org/pds/766 https://anabf.org/pierredangle/theme/tag:patrimoine%20XXe https://www.cairn.info/revue-vingtieme-siecle-revue-d-histoire-2018-1-page-99.htm https://www.fncaue.com/
Germany	Angermann, K. et al. (eds.) (2024) Denkmal Postmoderne. Bestände einer (un) geliebten Epoche. Basel/Berlin/Boston: Birkhäuser. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783035627855 .

	Ayón, A., Pottgiesser, U. and Richards, N. (2019) Neue Fassaden im Bestand: Sanierungsstrategien für Klassiker der Moderne. Basel: Birkhäuser. Berkemann, K. (ed.) (2021) Das Ende der Moderne? Unterwegs zu einer Architektur der 1990er Jahre. Berlin: Urbanophil. Bund Heimat und Umwelt in Deutschland (ed.) (2012) Klötze und Plätze: Wege zu einem neuen Bewusstsein für Großbauten der 1960er und 1970er Jahre ; Dokumentation der Tagung am 4. und 5. Juni 2012 im Rathaus Reutlingen. Bonn: Bund Heimat und Umwelt in Deutschland (BHU). Buttlar, A. von et al. (eds.) (2007) Denkmal! Moderne. Architektur der 60er Jahre. Wiederentdeckung einer Epoche. 1st edn. Berlin: Jovis (Jovis DiskursReihe 'Forschungen zur Nachkriegsmoderne'). Deutsches Nationalkomitee für Denkmalschutz (ed.) (2008) 1960 plus - ein ausgeschlagenes Erbe? Dokumentation der Tagung des Deutschen Nationalkomitees für Denkmalschutz am 17./18. April 2007 in Berlin. Bonn: Dt. Nationalkomitee für Denkmalschutz (Schriftenreihe des Deutschen Nationalkomitees für Denkmalschutz). Escherich, M. (ed.) (2012) Denkmal Ost-Moderne. Aneignung und Erhaltung des baulichen Erbes der Nachkriegsmoderne. Berlin: Jovis. Escherich, M. (ed.) (2016) Denkmal Ost-Moderne II. Denkmalpflegerische Praxis der Nachkriegsmoderne. Berlin: Jovis. Franz, B. and Meier, H.-R. (eds.) (2011) Stadtplanung nach 1945. Zerstörung und Wiederaufbau. Denkmalpflegerische Probleme aus heutiger Sicht. Holzminde: Mitkat. Gisbertz, O. (ed.) (2012) Nachkriegsmoderne kontrovers. Positionen der Gegenwart. Berlin: Jovis. Gisbertz, O. et al. (eds.) (2023) Reallabor Nachkriegsmoderne. Zum Umgang mit jüngeren Denkmälern. Berlin: Jovis. Available at: https://www.degruyter.com/isbn/9783868597547 (Accessed: 11 September 2024). Tragbar, K. (ed.) (2022) Die Zukunft der Nachkriegsmoderne: Positionen und Projekte. Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag. Wellnitz, F. (2016) Baudenkmale der Nachkriegsmoderne. Bauklimatische Ertüchtigung und nachhaltige Instandsetzung. Stuttgart: Fraunhofer IRB Verlag. Wüstenrot Stiftung (ed.) (2011) Denkmalpflege der Moderne. Konzepte für ein junges Architekturerbe. Ludwigsburg: Wüstenrot-Stiftung. Wüstenrot Stiftung (ed.) (2020) Moderne Architektur der DDR. Gestaltung, Konstruktion, Denkmalpflege. Erste Auflage. Leipzig: Spector Books. moderneREGIONAL (2024) Available at: https://www.moderne-regional.de/ (Accessed: 11 September 2024).
Greece	https://www.monumenta.org/browse/repository/data%3A3037?page=3&pageSize=20&sort=timestamps.modifiedAt%3Aasc&searchText=&searchTextType=fulltext&byPublicType=&byPerson=&byRelator=&byCollectiveBody=&byTown=&byDimos=&byAddress=&byKatedafismeno=&byDanger=&byAA=&byPhotoTypes=&byCharacterization=. https://docomomo.gr/about/.
Hungary	- Ferkai, András: Modern házak és lakóik: A Napraforgó utcai kislakásos mintatelep története Budapest, TERC kft. 2019 (ISBN: 9786155445675) - Haba Péter: Magyar ipari építészet 1945–1970. Budapest, TERC Kereskedelmi és Szolgáltató Kft, 2019. (ISBN: 9786155445637) - Ferkai András: Hatvanas évek: Újabb kísérlet egy korszak bejárására. ARS HUNGARICA 44 (2018) 2. pp.117-134. (https://epa.oszk.hu/01600/01615/00012/pdf/EPA01615_ars_hungarica_2018_2_117-134.pdf) - Ferkai, András: Molnár Farkas. Budapest, TERC Kereskedelmi és Szolgáltató Kft, 2011. (monography, 463 pages, ISBN: 9789639968134) - Vukoszávlyev, Zorán and Erzsébet Urbán: Magyarország templomépítésze 1945–1964 között: Vázlat az alkotóművészi értékeléssel megállapítható építészeti folytonosságról. ÉPÍTÉS-ÉPÍTÉSZETTUDOMÁNY 44 (2016) 3-4. pp.247-315. (https://real.mtak.hu/39276/) - Conference on postwar modern architecture: A XXX. ORSZÁGOS MŰEMLÉKI KONFERENCIA TANULMÁNYAI AZ 1945 UTÁNI ÉPÍTÉSZELETÜNK VÉDELMEÉRT I. (Special Issue) MŰEMLÉKVÉDELEM 66. (2022) 1. and A XXX. ORSZÁGOS MŰEMLÉKI KONFERENCIA TANULMÁNYAI AZ 1945 UTÁNI

	ÉPÍTÉSZETÜNK VÉDELMEÉRT II. (Special Issue) MŰEMLÉKVÉDELEM 66. (2022) 2-3. in this issue an article on a university survey project: Vukoszávlyev Zorán A modern mai szemmel. Egyetemi kutatási program a '45 utáni építészetünk értékvédelméért. MŰEMLÉKVÉDELEM 66 (2022) 2-3. pp.129-142. (https://real.mtak.hu/155601/) - database on postwar architecture founded by research cooperation between university faculties of architecture: https://eptort.bme.hu/tudastar/1945-utani-epiteszetunk/ - latest institutional exhibition on 20thC architecture: https://memmdk.hu/en/feeds/exhibitions/unbuilt-budapest-150-years-of-architectural-visions-in-budapest
India	a. Art Deco Mumbai (https://artdecomumbai.com) b. MODERN HERITAGE (https://thinkmatter.in/2018/12/18/modernheritage/) c. Jain, P. (2020) India's Modern Heritage. In M. Chalana & A. Krishna. (Eds.) Heritage Conservation in Postcolonial India: Approaches and Challenges. Routledge
Iran	Eskandar MOKHTARI TALEGHANI, Modern architectural heritage of Iran, Tehran: Cultural research office 2012 Bijan SHAFE'EI, Sohab SOROUSHIANS, & Viktor DANIEL, Architectural Monographs (7 Vols), Tehran 2008-2021 Amir BANI MASSOUD, Contemporary Iranian Architecture, Tehran: Honar-e Memari 2009 Nasser GHOBADIAN, Tradition and Modernity in Contemporary Iranian Architecture, Tehran: Elm-e Memar 2018 Naqsh Consulting Engineers, The Critic of Some Contemporary Iranian Architecture Projects, Tehran: Ministry of Housing and Urban Development 2013 Naqsh-e Jahan Pars Consulting Engineers, Contemporary Iranian Architecture, 75 years of experience in public architecture, Tehran: Ministry of Housing and Urban Development 2013 Mostafa KIANI, The Architecture of 1st Pahlavi Period, Tehran: The Institute for the Study of Contemporary Iranian History, 2010 An Architectural Anthology of Iranian Architecture (8 Vols. for Isfahan and Yazd Provinces), Isfahan: Me'markhane Baghshahr, 2014 Rouhollah MOJTAHEZADEH & Zahra NAMAVAR, In Search of the Urban Identity of Ahvaz, Tehran Center for Research in Housing and Urban Development 2014 Behrouz MARBAGHI and Negar JOKAR (eds.), 100 Architects, Tehran: Payam 2016 Arash TABIBZADEH NOURI, Kankash, Tehran: Tirmah 2021 Negar MANSOURI, One Century of Architecture, Ten Mansions of Tehran, Tehran: Municipality of Tehran, 2023
Ireland	a. More Than Concrete Blocks: Dublin city's twentieth-century buildings and their stories is a three volume series unpacking the history of Dublin's architecture during the twentieth century, each book covers a period, in chronological sequence: Volume 1, 1900-1939; Volume 2, 1940-1972; Volume 3, 1973-1999. https://www.ucdpress.ie/display.asp?isbn=9781910820124& b. A guide to Cork's 20th century architecture by Tom Spalding https://catalogue.nli.ie/Record/vtls000299454 c. Ulster Architects 1920s-1970's by Paul Larmour https://www.ulsterarchitecturalheritage.org.uk/shop/pre-order-architects-of-ulster-1920-1970s-hard-back/
Israel	https://exhibition.docomomo.com/, https://www.lieblinghaus.org/, https://www.icomos.org.il/, https://shimur.org/, https://ybz.org.il/
Italy	AA.VV. (2012) Confronti. Il restauro del moderno. Quaderni di restauro architettonico, Artem.Bruschi Greta, Paolo Faccio, Sergio Pratali Maffei, Paola Scaramuzza (2005), Il calcestruzzo nelle architetture di Carlo Scarpa. Forme, alterazioni, interventi, Ed. Vompatori. Carughi Ugo, Massimo Visone (2017). Time Frames: Conservation Policies for Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage, London-New York: Routledge De Notarpietro Stefania, Alessandra Ferrighi, Eliana Garofalo, Luciano Antonino Scuderi (eds.) (2024), Ereditare il presente. Conoscenza, tutela e valorizzazione dell'architettura italiana dal 1945 ad oggi, Magonza. Di Biase Carolina (2009), Il degrado del calcestruzzo nell'architettura del novecento, Maggioli Editore. Di Resta Sara, Giulia Favaretto, Marco Pretelli (2021), Materiali autarchici. Conservare l'innovazione, Il Poligrafo. Ientile Rosalba (2008), Architetture in cemento armato. Orientamenti per la conservazione, Franco Angeli. Poretti Sergio (con M. Casciato, S. Mornati; a cura di), Architettura Moderna in Italia. Documentazione e conservazione, Atti del Primo Convegno Nazionale Docomomo Italia, Roma 1999. Pratali Maffei Sergio, Federica Rovello, Il Moderno tra Conservazione e Trasformazione - Dieci anni di Do.Co.Mo.Mo. Italia: bilanci e prospettive, Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Trieste, 5-8 dicembre 2005.
Japan	DOCOMOMO Japan https://docomomojapan.com/?lang=en

Jordan	Daher, Rami. 2024, " Effect of typo-morphological analysis and place understanding on the nature of intervention within historic settings: the case of Amman, Jordan ", Archnet-International Journal of Architectural Research (IJAR), Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1108/ARCH-05-2022-0114. Daher, Rami. 2013. "Urban Heritage and the Contention between Tradition, Avant-garde, and Kitsch: Amman's Rising "Kitsch Syndromes" and its Creeping Vernacularized Urban Landscape." <i>Ethnologies: Journal of the Folklore Studies Association of Canada</i>, Volume 35, No. 2, p. 31 – 55. Arbid, Goerge, and Oswalt, Philipp (Eds). 2022, <i>Designing Modernity: Architecture in the Arab World 1945-1973</i>. Jovis Verlag, GmbH.
Lithuania	Marija Drėmaitė, Defining the Attributes for Modernist Urban Heritage: The Case of Kaunas 1919-1939, <i>Architecture of Optimism</i>, in: <i>Buildings</i>, 2023, 13, 196, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13010196 Drėmaitė, Marija. <i>Baltic Modernism. Architecture and Housing in Soviet Lithuania</i>. (Berlin: DOM Publishers, 2017), 291. Marija Drėmaitė, Vaidas Petrulis, Jūratė Tutlytė, <i>Architektūra sovietinėje Lietuvoje</i>, Vilnius: Vilniaus dailės akademija, 2012. Drėmaitė, Marija. Heritage of modern architecture in Lithuania: a theoretical aspect. <i>Journal of Architecture and Urbanism</i>, 36(3), 149-160. https://doi.org/10.3846/20297955.2012.732481 Petrulis, Vaidas. <i>Paveldas kaip konfliktas: metodologinės Lietuvos XX a. architektūrinio palikimo vertinimo prielaidos : mokslo monografija</i>. Kaunas: Technologija, 2019. 215 p. ISBN 9786090216057. eISBN 9786090216040. DOI: 10.5755/e01.9786090216040. Petrulis, Vaidas; Bugenienė, Sigita; Denison, Edward; Janušauskaitė, Viltė; Puodžiūnienė, Rugilė. <i>Conservation management plan for the military research laboratory in Kaunas: monograph / editor V. Petrulis; authors: S. Bugenienė, E. Denison, V. Janušauskaitė, V. Petrulis, R. Puodžiūnienė; researchers: R. Bliūdžius, H.A. Dogan, A. Grubinskaitė, E. Kielė, P.T. Laurinaitis, B. Prapuolenis, M. Staniūnas, V. Trečiokienė</i>. Kaunas: Technologija, 2021. 330 p. ISBN 9786090217771. eISBN 9786090217764. DOI: 10.5755/e01.9786090217764. Nekrošius, Liutauras. "Soviet Era Architecture and the Meaning It Holds for the People of Lithuania", <i>Place Meaning and Attachment. Authenticity, Heritage, and Preservation</i>, ed. by Dak Kopec, AnnaMarie Bliss. (New York: Routledge, 2020) Nekrošius Liutauras, Riaubienė Edita, <i>Palanga's modern architecture on the way to heritage, Architecture and urban planning</i>. Riga; Warsaw: Riga Technical University; Sciendo De Gruyter. vol. 14, iss. 1 (2018), p. 111-118 Černauskienė, Aušra. "Preservation Scenarios for Post-War Concrete Architecture: The Case of Lithuania". <i>Architecture and Urban Planning</i>, vol.19, no.1,(2023), 217-229. https://doi.org/10.2478/aup-2023-0020 Mankus Martynas, <i>Socialist Postmodernism. The Case of the Late Soviet Lithuanian Architecture, Architecture and Urban Planning</i>, 2017, 13 (1), p. 61–66
Malaysia	http://pam-er.wixsite.com/architecture
Morocco	https://www.heritagemaps.ma/adws/app/85582347-1983-11ee-8bca-e51c676799fb/ https://fspcrabat.ma/rabat-patrimoine-mondial/ https://mjcc.gov.ma/fr/le-ministere-de-la-culture-et-de-la-communication-publie-le-guide-plus-dun-siecle-dinventaire-du-patrimoine-culturel-marocain/ https://mjcc.gov.ma/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/catalogue-exposition-100-invtaire-au-maroc.pdf https://maisondulivre.ma/parutions/atlas-du-patrimoine-architectural-de-casablanca/ https://issuu.com/casamemoire/docs/guide_des_architectures_xxe_siecle_de_casablanca https://auc.ma/etudes-projets/gestion-de-patrimoine/ https://www.amazon.fr/Agadir-Building-Modern-Afropolis-anglais/dp/3038602760
New Zealand	Long Live The Modern Ed. By Dr Julia Gatley
Philippines	The online design journal Kanto is currently the country's best source of articles pertaining to 20th century heritage. https://kanto.com.ph/ An example is this article on the National Power Corporation building designed by National Artist for Architecture Leandro Locsin, which, in spite of protection provided by the Heritage Law, is in danger of demolition. https://kanto.com.ph/spaces/npc-buildings-locsin/
Poland	- Siwek Andrzej, Representative or unique – dilemmas in protecting architecture of the 2nd half of the 20th century, <i>Journal of Heritage Conservation</i>; 49/2017, pages: 125 - 133. - Myczkowski Zbigniew, Siwek Andrzej, Cultural Park Nowa Huta – a new formula for the protection of urban planning and architecture of the 2nd half of the 20th century; <i>Journal of Heritage Conservation</i>, 49/2017, pages: 113 - 124. - Siwek Andrzej, Protection of the Architectural Heritage of the Post-war Poland – Current Status and Future Prospects, /w:/ The 6th Baltic Sea Region Cultural Heritage Forum. From Postwar to Postmodern – 20th Century Built Cultural Heritage, Stockholm 2017, p. 113 – 120. - Szmygin B., Haspel J. (ed.), <i>Zabytki drugiej połowy XX wieku – waloryzacja, ochrona, konserwacja</i>. Warszawa–Berlin, 2010.

	- Kostuch Bożena , "Kolor i blask. Ceramika architektoniczna oraz mozaiki w Krakowie i Małopolsce po 1945 roku", Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie, Kraków 2015
Portugal	Afonso, J. (ed.). Inquérito à Arquitetura do Século XX em Portugal. Lisboa: Ordem dos Arquitectos, 2006. Ferreira, T. (ed.). Conversations: Álvaro Siza Ocean Swimming Pool (1960-2021). Porto: FAUP; Afrontamento, 2023. Ferreira, T. (coord.). Ocean Swimming Pool Conservation Management Plan. Porto: FAUP, 2024. Ferreira, Teresa; David Ordóñez Castañón; Póvoas, Rui. Novo/Antigo. Atlas do Projeto em Património Arquitectónico: Escola do Porto = New/old. Atlas of architectural heritage design: School of Porto.. Porto, Portugal: FAUP. 2023. Rocha, Luciana; Póvoas, Rui. Well-Balanced Energy Housing. Tectonic Series (TS). Porto, Portugal: Faculdade de Arquitectura da Universidade do Porto. 2023. Rocha, Luciana; Póvoas, Rui Fernandes; Restivo, Joana. "The Right to Comfort in Social Housing: Energy and Thermal Performances as Parameters of a Systemic Analysis". Buildings 13 5 (2023): 1173. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/buildings13051173. Ferreira, Teresa; Mendes, Nuno; Rui Fernandes Póvoas; Lourenço, Paulo B.. "Assessment Methodology for Conservation Planning of Concrete Buildings: Ocean Swimming Pool (1960–2021) by Álvaro Siza in Portugal". International Journal of Architectural Heritage (2022): 1-23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15583058.2022.2147877. Ferreira, Teresa Cunha. "Conservation of 20th-century architecture in Portugal. The lesson of Álvaro Siza. Proceedings of Metamorphosis. The Continuity of Change. 15th International Docomomo Conference (Ljubljana 28-31 August 2018)". Lubiana, 2018. Melenhorst, M.; Providência, P.; Canto Moniz, G. (ed). Reuse of modernist buildings: pedagogy and profession. Joelho n. 9. Coimbra: EDARQ, 2018. Rizo, V. Modern building reuse: documentation, maintenance, recovery and renewal. Guimarães: EAUM, 2014. Tostões, A. (ed). Modern Heritage: Reuse, renovation and restoration. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2022. Tostões, Ana; Arnaut, Daniela; Providência, Paulo. Cure and Care. Architecture and Health. Lisboa, Portugal: IST-ID. 2020. Tostões, Ana. Gulbenkian Headquarters and Museum. Architecture of the 60s. Lisboa, Portugal: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian. 2006. Tostões, Ana. Arquitectura Moderna Portuguesa, 1920-1970. Lisboa, Portugal: IPPAR. 2003. Tostões, Ana; Wang, W.; Becker, A.. Portugal: Architektur im 20. Lisboa, Portugal: Prestel / DAM / PF 97. 1997. Tostões, Ana; Ferreira, Zara. "Modern Lisbon". Docomomo Journal 55 (2016): https://doi.org/10.52200/55.1.MIBJ09HB. Tostões, Ana. Idade Maior. Cultura e tecnologia na Arquitectura Moderna Portuguesa. Porto, Portugal: FAUP. 2015. Tostões, Ana. Arquitectura Moderna e Obra Global a partir de 1900. Porto, Portugal: FUBU. 2009. Tostões, Ana. Arquitectura Portuguesa Contemporânea. Lisboa, Portugal: CTT. 2008. Tostões, Ana. Os Verdes Anos na Arquitectura Portuguesa dos Anos 50. Porto, Portugal: FAUP. 1997. Milheiro, Ana Vaz. Optimistic Suburbia 3 - The Researchers' Perspective. Mass-Housing infrastructures (Lisbon, Luanda, Macao). Lisboa, Portugal: AMDJAC. 2018. Arnaut, Daniela. "Post-war healthcare architecture in Portugal. From ordering bodies to the evasion of the Self" in Such, C. J., Figueres, M. P., Tostões, A., Pottgiesseer, U., (ed.), Modern Design: Social Commitment & Quality of Life, 17th International Docomomo Conference, Valencia, 2022, 319-328. [ISBN: 978-84-19286-59-8]. 2022 Correia, Luís Miguel; Moniz, Gonçalo Canto; Pais, Teresa. Desenhar Távora: sete percursos. Coimbra, Portugal: eldjarq. 2024 Moniz, Gonçalo. 74-14 Saal and Architecture. 2016. Bandeirinha, José António; Moniz, Gonçalo Canto; Martins, Carlos. Fernando Távora Modernidade Permanente / Fernando Távora Permanent Modernity. Porto, Portugal: Casa da Arquitectura, Guimarães 2012, FIMS, Família Fernando Távora. 2013. Moniz, Gonçalo Canto; Correia, Luís Miguel; Gonçalves, Adelino. "Fernando Távora Oporto's Urban Renewal: A Changing Moment in Urban Rehabilitation Policy Debate". Journal of Urban History 45 4 (2017): 765-785. Moniz, Gonçalo Canto. "The Portuguese "May 68": Politics, Education and Architecture". European journal of American studies 3 2 (2008): http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/ejas.7253. Bandeirinha, José António. "Before April: The Housing Issue". In Hidden in Plain Sight: Politics and Design in State-Subsidized Residential Architecture, editado por Rui Jorge Garcia Ramos; Virgílio Borges Pereira; Marta Rocha Moreira; Sérgio Dias Silva, 353-369. Zurique, Suíça: Park Books, 2021. Pinto, P. T.; Delgado, J. P.. "Portugal dos Pequenitos as an urban laboratory for rehearsing national identity". Nations and Nationalism 25 4 (2019): 1296-1324. Tostões, Ana; Ferreira, Zara. "Housing for the greatest number in Lisbon (1960s-1970s): Olivais and Telheiras. Analysis of the domestic space in its relationship with the ways of life of different social classes". Architektúra & Urbanizmus 56 3-4 (2023): 228-245

	*among many others.
Romania	http://www.icomos.ro/ https://bacu.ro/ https://patrimoniul.ro/
Russian Federation	The bibliography on the history of 20th century Soviet architecture and urban planning of various periods is huge. This list [presented in chronological order] includes only selected publications aimed at protection and conservation of 20th century heritage. 20th Century. Preservation of Cultural Heritage. Collective monograph. N. Dushkina, A. Kudryavtsev (eds.). Rus./Eng. Moscow Architectural Institute, Moscow, 2006. Heritage at Risk. Preservation of 20th Century Architecture and World Heritage. Proceedings of Scientific conference, Abstracts Collection. 17-20 April 2006. N. Dushkina, A. Kudryavtsev (eds.). Rus./Eng. Moscow Architectural Institute, Moscow, 2006. Heritage at Risk. The Soviet Heritage and European Modernism. J. Haspel, M. Petzet, A. Zalivako, J. Ziesemer (eds.). ICOMOS Heritage at Risk Special Edition 2006. Berlin, 2007. The Soviet avant-garde of the 1920s - 1930s. Scientific collection. Moscow: Department of Cultural Heritage of Moscow, 2008. Avantgarde und Welterbe. Eine gemeinsame Denkschrift des Deutschen und Russischen Nationalkomitees von ICOMOS und des ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on 20th Century Heritage, ICOMOS, 2008. Alvar Aalto Library in Vyborg. Saving a Modern Masterpiece. Ed. E. Adlercreutz, L. Englund, M. Kairamo, T. Mustonen, V. Nava. The Finnish Committee for the Restoration of Viipuri Library. Rakennustieto Publishing, Helsinki, 2009. Alvar Aalto Library in Vyborg. Saving a Modern Masterpiece, Part 2. Ed. E. Adlercreutz, M. Kairamo, T. Mustonen. The Finnish Committee for the Restoration of Viipuri Library. Rakennustieto Publishing, Helsinki, 2009. A. Zalivako, Die Bauten des Russischen Konstruktivismus. Moskau 1919-32. Baumaterial, Baukonstruktion, Erhaltung, Michael Imhof Verlag, Petersberg, 2012. J. Cramer, A. Zalivako, Das Narkomfin-Kommunehaus in Moskau (1928-2012). Michael Imhof Verlag, Petersberg, 2013. The Narkomfin Building. Restoration 2016-2020. Department of Cultural Heritage, Moscow, 2020. https://www.mos.ru/dkn/documents/view/248242220/ A. Ginzburg. The Narkomfin Building. Restoration. https://ginzburg.ru/en/projects/restoration/dom-narkofminamoskva P. Kuznetsov, N. Tyutcheva, A. Molchanov. Melnikov's House. Tatlin, Yekaterinburg, 2022
Saudi Arabia	saudi-icomos.org
Singapore	www.docomomo.sg Various essays, online inventory of 20th C places in Singapore Chang Jiat Hwee, Ho Weng Hin and Tan Kar Lin. "Conserve a building, save the planet: New reason to conserve Singapore's landmark modernist buildings" in The Straits Times Opinion section on 12 November 2020 https://www.docomomo.sg/happenings/conserv-a-building-save-the-planet https://www.nus.edu.sg/newshub/news/2020/2020-11/2020-11-12/BUILDING-st-12nov-pA24.pdf mASEANa Project 2019 : "progressive once more" rejuvenating mid-century modern architecture in Southeast Asia : the report of mASEANs Proejct 2019 8th & 9th International Conference https://eservice.nlb.gov.sg/flipviewer/data/booksg_publish/d/db8f7e45-58f9-4cb8-9022-eb8619babc56/web/html5/index.html?opf=tablet/BOOKSG.xml&launchlogo=tablet/BOOKSG_BrandingLogo.png&pn=1 Singapore Heritage Society, Too Young To Die: Giving New Lease of Life to Singapore's Modernist Icons, August 2018. https://www.singaporeheritage.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/SHS-Position-Paper-Too-Young-To-Die-Aug-2018.pdf Chang, Jiat Hwee, Ho, Weng Hin and Tan, Kar Lin "Adding value without demolition, rebuilding: regeneration Singapore's Modernist Icons" in Business Times, 7 April 2018

	https://www.nus.edu.sg/newshub/news/2018/2018-04/2018-04-07/Adding-BT-p34.pdf Ho, Weng Hin, Dinesh Naidu, and Kar Lin Tan. Our Modern Past: A Visual Survey of Singapore Architecture, 1920s-1970s. Singapore: Singapore Heritage Society and SIA Press, 2015 Wong, Yunn Chii, ed. Singapore 1:1 City: A Gallery of Architecture and Urban Design. Singapore: Urban Redevelopment Authority, 2005. Wong, Yunn Chii, ed. Singapore 1:1 Island: A Gallery of Architecture and Urban Design. Singapore: Urban Redevelopment Authority, 2007.
Slovenia	KOSELJ, Nataša, PRELOVŠEK, Damjan, ZUPANČIČ, Bogo, MIHELIČ, Breda, HRAUSKY, Andrej, BERNIK, Stane, PIRKOVIČ, Jelka. Do_co,mo.mo_Slovenia_100. 1. ponatis. Ljubljana: Ustanova France in Marta Ivanšek, 2017. 177 str., ilustr. ISBN 978-961-285-793-6. https://www.docomomo.si IFKO, Sonja, BRITOVŠEK, Brina, KERŠIČ, Andraž, RIJAVEC, Miha, ŠUŠTERIČ, ADAMIČ, Tatjana, IFKO, Sonja. Ferantov vrt : trajnostni pristopi za varstvo povojne arhitekturne dediščine 20. stoletja = Sustainable approaches for protection of post-war architecture of 20th century. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za arhitekturo, 2018. ZUPANČIČ, Tadeja (ed.), IFKO, Sonja (ed.) FIKFAK, Alenka (ed.), JUVANČIČ, Matevž (ed.), VEROVŠEK, Špela (ed.). Manual of wise management, preservation, reuse and economic valorisation of architecture of totalitarian regimes of the 20th century. Forli: Municipality; Ljubljana: Faculty of Architecture, 2013. IFKO, Sonja (ed.). Resilient heritage = Dediščina, ki kljubuje. Ljubljana: Slovenian National Committee of ICOMOS, International Council on Monuments and Sites: = ICOMOS Slovenija - Slovensko nacionalno združenje za spomenike in spomeniška območja, 2022. 190 str., ilustr., graf. prikazi. Monographic Publications of ICOMOS Slovenia, 04. ISBN 978-961-94851-4-9. KOSELJ, Nataša. Korzenie słoweńskiego strukturalizmu : od Plečnika do Ravnikara : stulecie Lublańskiej Szkoły Architektury = The roots of Slovenian structuralism : from Plečnik to Ravnikar and Beyond : centenary of the Ljubljana School of Architecture. In: SOŁTYSIK, Maria Jolanta (ur.). Architektura XX wieku : zachowanie jej autentyczności i integralności w Gdyni i w Europie = Architecture of the 20th century : preservation of its authenticity and integrity in Gdynia and Europe. Gdynia: Wydział Architektury Politechniki Gdańskiej: = Faculty of Architecture, Gdańsk University of Technology, 2020. Str. [65]-70, ilustr. Modernizm w Europie - modernizm w Gdyni, 7. ISBN 978-83-952719-4-6, ISBN 978-83-64333-30-9. ISSN 2657-3873. KOSELJ, Nataša. Koseze Housing estate, Ljubljana : Viktor Pust : 1968-81. The Koseze settlement in Ljubljana. V: STEIXNER, Gerhard (ur.). Luxury for all : milestones in European stepped terrace housing. Basel: Birkhäuser, cop. 2020. Str. 195-204. ISBN 978-3-0356-1884-6. IFKO, Sonja. Slovenia in a Yugoslavian context : practising architecture on the third side of the Cold War. V: HÖKERBERG, Håkan (ur.). Architecture as propaganda in twentieth-century totalitarian regimes : history and heritage. Firenze: Edizioni Polistampa, 2018. p. 219-244. ISBN 978-88-596-1835-5.
South Africa	Docomomo SA
Spain	- Centellas, Miguel; Jordá, Carmen; Landrove, Susana (eds.). Vivienda Moderna. Registro DoCoMoMo Ibérico, 1925-1965. Barcelona: Fundación Caja de Arquitectos, colección. Arqu-Temas, nº 27, 2009. - Conferencia Internacional CAH20thC. Criterios de intervención en el patrimonio arquitectónico del siglo XX. Documento de Madrid 2011. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, 2011. - García Braña, Celestino; Gómez Agustí, Carlos; Landrove, Susana; Pérez Escolano, Víctor. Arquitectura del movimiento moderno en España: Registro DOCOMOMO Ibérico, 1925-1965: catálogo inicial de edificios del Plan Nacional de Conservación del Patrimonio Cultural del Siglo XX. Madrid, Fundación Docomomo Ibérico, 2018. - Instituto del Patrimonio Cultural de España. Plan Nacional de Patrimonio del siglo XX. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte. 2015. - Instituto del Patrimonio Cultural de España. Revista Patrimonio cultural de España, nº 10. El patrimonio cultural del siglo XX, una riqueza en riesgo. 2015. - Landrove, Susana (ed.). Equipamientos I. Lugares públicos y nuevos programas, 1925-1965. Registro DoCoMoMo Ibérico. Barcelona: Fundación Caja de Arquitectos, colección. Arqu-Temas, nº 30, 2010. - Landrove, Susana (ed.). Equipamientos II. Ocio, deporte, transporte y turismo, 1925-1965. Registro DoCoMoMo Ibérico. Barcelona: Fundación Caja de Arquitectos, colección. Arqu-Temas, nº 32, 2011. - Vela, Fernando (ed.). La conservación del patrimonio arquitectónico del siglo XX: criterios y experiencias en España y América Latina. Madrid: Fundación Diego de Sagredo, 2019.

	- La arquitectura del siglo XX en España, Gibraltar y las regiones francesas de Aquitaine, Auvergne, Languedoc-Roussillon, Limousin, Midi-Pyrénées y Poitou-Charentes. Barcelona: Fundación Docomomo Ibérico, Fundación Caja de Arquitectos, Fundación Mies van der Rohe, 2007. - La arquitectura del Sol / Sunland architecture. Barcelona: Colegios de Arquitectos de Catalunya, Illes Balears, Comunitat Valenciana, Región de Murcia, Islas Canarias y de Almería, Granada y Málaga, 2002. http://hdl.handle.net/10045/139218
Sweden	http://www.modernismenivastmanland.se/ https://mellanarkiv-offentlig.vgregion.se/alfresco/s/archive/stream/public/v1/source/available/sofia/ku3231-1304641699-215/native/Moderna%20monument%20%E2%80%93%20fr%C3%A5n%20vardagligt%20till%20storslaget%20Bebyggelse%20i%20V%C3%A4stra%20G%C3%B6taland%201930%E2%80%931980.pdf
Thailand	Publications Books: I(n English and Thai) - Lassus Pongkwan, Architectural Heritage in Thailand vol.1, Bangkok, Association of Siamese Architects under Royal Patronage (ASA), Bangkok, 2004 (174 Architectural Conservation Award winner building but not only 20C Heritage) - Lassus Pongkwan, Architectural Heritage in Thailand vol.2, Bangkok, Association of Siamese Architects under Royal Patronage (ASA), Bangkok, 2013 (183 Architectural Conservation Award winner building but not only 20C Heritage) - Lassus Pongkwan & Vasu Pohyanandhana, Architectural Heritage in Thailand vol.2, Bangkok, Association of Siamese Architects under Royal Patronage (ASA), Bangkok, (will be published) in 2025 (111 Architectural Conservation Award winner building but not only 20C Heritage) - Chukaew Parinya, 111 years Makkasan Train Factory, Bangkok, The State Railways of Thailand, 2021 - Suwatcharapinun San, Modern Architecture: Chiangmai Buildings in the 60's and 70's, Chiangmai, 2020 - Walter Kotidek, Modern Bangkok, Bangkok, River books, (will be published in) 2025 E-books: (in Thai language) - E-book: Sirikiatikul Pinai, "Unpack the Archives: Amorn Sriwongse", The Association of Siamese Architects, Bangkok, 2020 - E-book: Ardruga, Winyu, "Modern Mosque / Modern Muslim: The Foundation of Islamic Centre of Thailand by Paichit Pongpunluk." In Ardruga, Winyu (ed.)(2020). Multiple Modernities: Modern Architecture in Thailand, The Association of Siamese Architects, Bangkok, 2020 Articles: in English - Lassus Pongkwan, "Modern Architecture in Thailand", Docomomo Journal 57, 2017 - Lassus Pongkwan, "Makkasan Train Factory: an attempt to preserve Bangkok's urban heritage", Docomomo Journal 63, 2020 - Sirikiatikul Pinai, "Urban Renewal on Ratchadamnoen Boulevard and it's Architect, 1939-1941", mASEANa project 2016 International Conference/Workshop proceeding, Docomomo Japan, 2016 - Abhichartvorapan, The making of Thailand's Vocational Education Project, 1965-70; Collaboration between Thailand and Japan, mASEANa project 2018 International Conference/Workshop proceeding, Docomomo Japan, 2018 - Siricururattana Pornpas, Inventory and History of modern architecture in Bangkok, mASEANa project 2018 International Conference/Workshop proceeding, Docomomo Japan, 2018
The Netherlands	NB The majority of publications on conservation is in Dutch and issued in small journals, particularly local projects. As a principle, there is not a great divide between pre-20C and 20C heritage. In addition, most projects are not so much focused on mere conservation but rather on reuse and redevelopment and making buildings more sustainable. The following list contains just a selection of publications. - Adriaansz., E., Laan, B., Molenaar, J. & Simon Thomas, M., The Sonneveld House. Brinkman & van der Vlugt. An Avant-garde Home from 1933, Rotterdam 2001 - Beek, R van, Bommel, W van & Geest, H van der, Elektrich licht in historische interieurs, Den Haag 2011 - Bet, E. & Hinterthür, H. (eds.), Kleur Veenhuizen. Handboek voor onderhoud, Assen 2022. - Clarke, N.J., How Heritage Learns: Dutch Public Housing Heritage Evolution in Ecosystemic Perspective, Delft 2021 [https://doi.org/10.7480/abe.2021.14] - Haaren, M. van & Oostenbrink, M., Het beste verbeterboek, architectuurherstel als cultureel ambacht, 2008 - Hage, K., Ruitenbeek, J. & Zweerink, K. Van Pendrecht tot Ommoord. Geschiedenis en toekomst van de naoorlogse wijken in Rotterdam, Bussum 2005 - Heinemann, H.A., Historic Concrete: From Concrete Repair to Concrete Conservation, Delft 2013 [https://doi.org/10.4233/uuid:987fafd0-cd76-4230-be0e-be8843cae08e] - Hermans, T., Hunen, M. van & Ven, H. van de (eds.), Monumenten van beton: ontwikkeling en herstel van historisch beton, Zeist 2016 - Lauwen, T. e.a., Rietveld's design factory re_newed, Tiel 2017

	- Luursema, E. & B. Mulder (eds.), Handboek renovatie Gordel 20-40. Architectuurherstel in Amsterdam, Bussum 1995 - Meurs, P. & Thoor, MA van, Sanatorium Zonnestraal. The History and Restoration of a Modern Monument, Rotterdam 2010 - Pfeiffer, C., Thamerlaan 14, Michel de klerks vroegste ontwerp, Amsterdam 2022 (Heemschutserie 4) See also: www.cultureelerfgoed.nl/bibliotheekcatalogus (on-line catalogue for all heritage publications) www.nrp.nl/guldenfeniks (renovation)
Tunisia	Tunis 1800-1950 - Portrait architectural et urbain ; ELYZAD, 2006 ; Tunis : Patrimoine vivant ; SIMPACT, 2013 ; Tunis d'une ville à l'autre, cartographie et histoire urbaine 1860-1935, 2010 Nirvana ; Tunis, l'Orient de la modernité, 2010, éditions Déméter ; Tunis Patrimoine vivant, conservation et créativité, ASM (1980-2012), 2013, éditions SIMPACT.
Turkey	Altan, T. E. (2021) "Modern Mimarlık Mirası Korunabiliyor mu? [Can Modern Architectural Heritage Be Protected?]", Serbest Mimar, no.42, pp.66-68. Altan, T. E., E. Omay Polat (eds.) (2018) "docomomo_tr: 15 Yılın Birikimi [The Accumulation of 15 Years], Betonart, no.56. Altan, T. E., Y. Salman, E. Omay Polat, N. Baturayoğlu Yöney (eds.) (2019) "Modern Mimarlık Mirası [Modern Architectural Heritage]", Dosya, Mimarlar Odası Ankara Şubesi Yayını [Publication of the Ankara Branch of Chamber of Architects], no.43. Balamir, A. (2021) "Tanınmayı Tanıtmaya Çalışmak: Yok Edilen Modern Mirasın Ardından [Trying to Familiarize the Unknown: After the Destroyed Modern Heritage]", Serbest Mimar, no.42, pp.74-77. Baturayoğlu Yöney, N. (2014) "Modern Mimarlık Mirasının Kabulü ve Korunması: Uluslararası Ölçüt ve İkelere İlişkin Bir Değerlendirme [The Recognition and Preservation of Modern Architectural Heritage: An Evaluation of International Criteria and Principles]", Restorasyon Konservasyon Çalışmaları [Journal of İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality Directorate of Conservation Practice and Control], no.17, pp.62-76. Baturayoğlu Yöney, N. Salman, Y. Omay Polat, E. (2017) "Turkey", in U. Carughi, M. Visone (eds.) Time Frames: Conservation Policies for Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage, Routledge, pp.331-334. Madran, E., A. H. Alptekin (eds.) (2011) Cumhuriyetin Mimarlık Mirası, Sempozyum Bildirileri [Architectural Heritage of the Republic, Symposium Proceedings], February 26-27, 2009, Mimarlar Odası Yayın [Publication of the Chamber of Architects]. Madran, E., E. Altan Ergut (eds.) (2007) Korumada Yeni Tanımlar, Yeni Kavramlar: Cumhuriyet Dönemi Mimari Mirasının Korunması [New Definitions, New Concepts in Conservation: Conservation of the Republican Period Architectural Heritage in Türkiye], TMMOB Mimarlar Odası. Omay Polat, E. (2023) "Modern Mimarlığın Kültür Varlığı olarak Algısı [The Perception of Modern Architecture as Cultural Property]", in A. Aksoy, et al (eds.) Kültür Mirası Yönetimi: Neden ve Nasıl? Türkiye'den Deneyimler ve Tartışmalar [Management of Cultural Heritage: Why and How? Experiences and Discussions from Türkiye], İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, pp.587-596. Omay Polat, E. (2008) "Modern Mimarlık Mirasını Onaylamak: Yasal Süreç ve Tescil Kararlarına Bakış [Approving the Modern Architectural Heritage: A View on the Legal Process and Registration Decisions]", Mimarlık [Architecture], no.340. Omay Polat, E. (2008) "Türkiye'nin Modern Mimarlık Mirasının Korunması: Kuram ve Yöntem Bağlamında Bir Değerlendirme [Conservation of Modern Architectural Heritage in Türkiye: A Theoretical and Methodological Evaluation]", Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Yıldız Technical University. Omay Polat, E., N. Yöney (2022) "Workshops as a Tool for Education in Modern Heritage Conservation: 1st docomomo Workshop in Ataköy, İstanbul, 2006", TÜBA-KED [Turkish Academy of Sciences-Journal of Cultural Inventory], no.25, pp.117-134. Salman, Y., N. Baturayoğlu Yöney, E. Omay Polat, E. Altan Ergut (2013) "Modern Mimarlık Mirasının Korunması ve docomomo_Türkiye [Conservation of Modern Architectural Heritage and docomomo_Türkiye]", Betonart, no.36, pp.52-57. WEB SITE / docomomo turkey (http://www.docomomo-tr.org/), docomomo turkey youtube account (https://www.youtube.com/@docomomoturkiye)
United States of America	Marsden, Susan, and Peter Spearritt. 2021. The Twentieth-Century Historic Thematic Framework: A Tool for Assessing Heritage Places. With contributions from Leo Schmidt, Sheridan Burke, Gail Ostergren, Jeff Cody, and Chandler McCoy. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute. Available in English, French and Spanish Macdonald, Susan, and Gail Ostergren, eds. Conserving Twentieth-Century Built Heritage: A Bibliography. 2nd ed. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Conservation Institute, 2013: A comprehensive bibliography listing over 330 new citations focused on the conservation of twentieth-century buildings and structures[1].

	Jester, Thomas C., ed. Twentieth-Century Building Materials: History and Conservation. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 2014 : Provides an in-depth look at the materials and methods used in twentieth-century construction, including essays by leading experts[2]. Croft, Catherine, and Susan Macdonald, eds. Concrete: Case Studies in Conservation Practice. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 2019: Features fourteen case studies addressing the challenges of conserving concrete structures[3]. Prudon, Theodore, and Kyle Normandin, eds. Concrete and Modernism: Technology and Conservation. Preservation Technology Dossier 14. New York: Docomomo US, 201: Proceedings of the Docomomo International Specialist Committee/Technology sessions during the 3rd annual Docomomo US National Symposium from June 2015. Prudon, Theodore H.M. Conserving Modern Architecture. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2008: Addresses the unique challenges of conserving modern architecture, including philosophical issues and preservation standards. Macdonald, Susan, and Ana Paula Arato Gonçalves. 2020. Conservation Principles for Concrete of Cultural Significance. Principles. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute. http://hdl.handle.net/10020/gci_pubs/conservation_principles_concrete Available in English, French and Spanish Flaman, Bernard, and Chandler McCoy, eds. Managing Energy Use in Modern Buildings: Case Studies in Conservation Practice. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 2015 Focuses on energy management in modern buildings, providing case studies and practical solutions for conservation. "Modern Architecture and Climate: Design before Air Conditioning" (2020) by Daniel A. Barber: Explores the relationship between modern architecture and climate, emphasizing sustainable design practices. Preservation Brief 15, Preservation of Historic Concrete: Problems and General Approaches. William B. Coney. 2004 : Provides guidelines for the preservation of reinforced concrete structures, a common material in modern architecture. Ayon, Angel, Uta Pottgiesser, and National Richards. Reglazing Modernism: Intervention Strategies for 20th Century Icons. New York: Docomomo US, 2022 Includes case studies for interventions to steel-frame glazing assemblies in 20th century modern curtain walls. Slaton, Deborah, and William G. Foulks, eds. Preserving the Recent Past 3. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 201: A collection of papers from the third conference on preserving recent past architecture, focusing on modern heritage.
Uruguay	Modernos,(2015) Montevideo: IHA Facultad de Arquitectura UDELAR, https://fa.ort.edu.uy/patrimonio-moderno
Venezuela	Due to the length of the list, we have sent it by email. However, we refer to some websites: • Alba Ciudad 96.3. (2024). Catalog of Venezuelan Cultural Heritage. Available at https://albaciudad.org/catalogo-del-patrimonio-cultural-venezolano/ • Docomomo Venezuela (2023). Docomomo Ve. Available at: http://docomomovenezuela.blogspot.com/ • Fundación para la Cultura Urbana (2024). Fundación para la Cultura Urbana, Caracas: FCU. Available at https://cultura-urbana.com/ • Fundación Villanueva. (n.d.). Fundación Villanueva Caracas. [Website inactive]. • Icomos Venezuela. (2024). Venezuelan Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites. Available at https://icomosdevenezuela.blogspot.com/ • Martínez, Alesia. (2013). Venezuelan Cultural Heritage Registry (RPC-Venezuela). In Museos VE. No. 26. Available at https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=4459973 • Peña, M.I.; González Viso, I; Vegas, F. (2014). Caracas from the Valley to the Sea. Architecture and Landscape Guide. Seville: Junta de Andalucía. Available at https://guiaccs.com/ • UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage. (n.d.) The Venezuelan experience in inventory creation. Available at https://ich.unesco.org/es/la-experiencia-venezolana-00265

Appendix XI: Civic, National or Local Groups

Please identify up to 10 civic, national or local groups active in twentieth heritage conservation in your country, and briefly describe their activities. Please provide links if possible	
Argentina	-ICOMOS Argentina, https://www.icomos.org.ar -Docomomo Argentina working party, https://docomomo.com/tag/docomomo-argentina/ -Research group at several academic institutions: University of Buenos Aires, University of Belgrano, University of Tucumán, University of Mendoza, Catholic University of Santa Fe - Posadas Campus. -Moderna Buenos Aires, https://modernabuenosaires.org/ - Art Deco Argentina, https://www.artdecoargentina.com.ar/ - CICOP Argentina, https://cicop.blogspot.com/
Australia	DOCOMOMO AUSTRALIA https://docomomoaustralia.com.au/category/db_bld/ NATIONAL TRUST NSW Intertwar heritage surveys; https://www.nationaltrust.org.au/nsw/ Canberra Modern. brilliant example of advocacy https://canberramodern.com/ Robin Boyd Foundation. https://robinboyd.org.au/ Beaumaris Modern https://beaumarismodern.com.au/ Haberfield Association. https://haberfield.asn.au/ Walter Burley Griffin Society- Castlecrag. https://www.griffinsociety.org/ Art Deco and Modernist Society of Australia https://www.artdeco.org.au/ Adelaide Modernist https://www.modernistadelaide.com/ Save Our Sirius http://saveoursirius.org/
Bosnia Herzegovina	1. NC ICOMOS in Bosnia and Herzegovina, https://www.icomosubih.ba/ 2. Docomomo BiH, https://aabh.ba/o-nama-docomomobh/ 3. Faculty of Architecture- University of Sarajevo, https://af.unsa.ba/about-us/ 4. Faculty of architecture, civil engineer and geodesy- University of Banja Luka, https://aggf.unibl.org/ ; 5. Republički zavod za zaštitu spomenika, https://fmks.gov.ba/hr/zavod-za-zastitu-spomenika/ ; 6. Republički zavod za zaštitu kulturno-istorijskog i prirodnog naslijeđa, https://nasljedje.org/o-zavodu/ 7. Zavod za zaštitu kulturno-istorijskog i prirodnog naslijeđa Kantona Sarajevo, https://www.spomenici-sa.ba/
Brazil	ICOMOS (national committee and national scientific committee) Docomomo CAU - Council of Architecture and Urbanism of Brazil TICCIH - https://ticcihbrasil.org.br/
Bulgaria	Bulgarian Modernist Architecture Foundation - non-profit organization, focused on research of the Bulgarian architectural and art history in the Interwar period - 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s - https://foundationbma.org/about-us-3-61 Docomomo Bulgaria – Bulgarian chapter of DOCOMOMO International focused on research, documentation, preservation and promotion of the 20th century Modern movement heritage - https://www.facebook.com/docomomobulgaria New Architectural Heritage Foundation - non-profit organization dedicated to research, promotion and strategic development of Bulgarian architecture created after the Second World War as cultural heritage - https://nan.bg/
Canada	ICOMOS Canada: education, reach-out, advocacy. Docomomo Québec: research, publications, education, reach-out, advocacy. Héritage Montréal: research, publications, education, reach-out, advocacy. Action patrimoine: publications, reach-out, advocacy. Winnipeg Architecture Foundation: research, publications, reach-out.

China	National Cultural Heritage Administration of China has announced several batches of national key cultural relics protection units, coordinated the organisation of the third and fourth national cultural relics census, included a large number of modern and contemporary types of immovable cultural relics in the corresponding lists, and carried out effective protection and management actions. The China Academy of Cultural Heritage, over the years, has been actively carrying out modern and 20th century research work, and has carried out a number of related maintenance works, conservation planning, investigation and research work, such as the maintenance works at the former site of Belgian Embassy, the maintenance works at the former site of Union Hospital, the design of preservation, display and utilisation design of the former site of Huashui Cement Factory, and the conservation planning of the Red Building of Peking University. ICOMOS China has organised the selection of outstanding monument and site protection projects, and has been commissioned by the National cultural heritage Administration of China to convene and participate in management planning review meetings, all of which encompassed twentieth-century cultural heritage projects. Through these activities, we have promoted excellent practical experience, enhanced the scientificity and operability of the projects, and promoted the interpretation and conservation of heritage. The 20th Century Architectural Heritage Committee of the Chinese Society of Cultural Heritage compiled and released the 'Criteria for the Identification of China's 20th Century Architectural Heritage (Trial Draft)' (August 2014), identified 900 20th century architectural heritages in nine batches, organised symposiums, edited and distributed relevant books, and actively promoted 20th century architectural heritage to the public. The Committee on Industrial Architectural Heritage of the Architectural Society of China and The Committee of Industrial Heritage of the Chinese Society of Cultural Heritage regularly organises academic seminars and publishes proceedings. The Architectural Society of China architectural history branch, holds annual academic conference. Chinese heritage protection technology association modern building protection professional committee, devotes to modern building heritage protection theory, technology, craft, material research and promotion. Architectural Society of China urban and rural built heritage professional committee, dedicated to built heritage protection and historical environment regeneration.
Colombia	Ministry of Culture of Colombia; National Committee of ICOMOS - Colombia; Colombian Society of Architects; National University of Colombia; Rogelio Salmona Foundation; District Institute of Cultural Heritage (Bogotá).
Cyprus	Department for the Preservation of Cultural Heritage, Department of Town Planning and Housing, Ministry of Interior, Republic of Cyprus: The competent authority for the listing and protection of mid to late Twentieth Century Buildings. Docomomo Cyprus: The local chapter of Docomomo International. Working on the local pursuit of the goals of Docomomo international. [More information available online at https://www.facebook.com/p/Docomomo-Cyprus-61554518515372/] ICOMOS Cyprus: the National Committee of ICOMOS dealing also with issues related to the local Twentieth-century heritage. [More information available online at https://www.facebook.com/p/ICOMOS-Cyprus-100064509949701/] Cyprus Architectural Heritage Organisation: local specialised interest group dealing also with issues related to the local Twentieth-century heritage [More information available online at http://www.cyprusculturalheritage.org/index_en.html] Scientific Committee for Historic Concrete Structures, Scientific and Technical Chamber of Cyprus: The specialised scientific committee of the Chamber dealing with issues of documentation and protection of historic concrete structures. Mesarch research laboratory, Department of Architecture, University of Cyprus: the Mesarch Lab is conducting critical historical research on Architecture/urbanism and politics in 20th Century Eastern Mediterranean and especially Cyprus. The laboratory is conducting important work on the digitisation of architectural archives of important local architects of the Twentieth-century. [More information available online at https://mesarch.ucy.ac.cy] Building Materials Laboratory (BML), Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Cyprus: the activities of the laboratory cover the whole spectrum of materials including local twentieth century materials and their conservation. [More information available online at https://websites.ucy.ac.cy/bml/en/index.html]

Czech Republic	Docomomo Czech Republic - https://www.fa.cvut.cz/docomomo; Department of Theory and History of Architecture, Faculty of Architecture CTU Prague - https://www.fa.cvut.cz/cs/fakulta/organizacni-struktura/ustavy/140-ustav-teorie-a-dejin-architektury; Institute of Art History, Czech Academy of Science - https://www.udu.cas.cz/en; Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design in Prague - https://www.umprum.cz/cs/web/o-umprum/veda-a-vyzkum; National Heritage Institute - https://www.npu.cz/cs/o-nas/projekty/temata/77993-architektura-60-a-70-let-20-stoleti-a-pamatkova-pece; A489 - https://www.a489.cz/; Vetřelci a Volavky - https://www.vetrelciavolavky.cz/; Regional Gallery of Fine Arts in Zlín - https://www.galeriezin.cz/en/; Museum Olomouc - https://muo.cz/en/
Denmark	ICOMOS DK, https://icomos.dk/ By og Land Danmark / udvalget for Nyere Tids Arkitektur, https://byogland.dk/ Docomomo Denmark, https://www.facebook.com/docomomodk/?locale=da_DK Selskabet til bevaring af industrikultur (represents Denmark in TICCIH), https://fabrikogbolig.dk/ Selskabet for Arkitekturhistorie http://www.arkhist.dk/tidsskriftet-architectura Europa Nosta (award for the restauration of Arne Jacobsen's petrol station and Kaj Gottlob's open-air school Skolen ved Sundet), https://www.europa-nostra.dk/ Foreningen til gamle bygningers bevaring, https://www.gbb.dk/
Dominican Republic	Dominican ICOMOS DOCOMOMO SARD (Dominican Society of Architects) PATCODIA (Heritage Chapter of the Institute of Engineers, Architects and Surveyors) Erwin Walter Palm Foundation UNPHU (Pedro Henriquez Ureña University). Conducting seminars and conferences UTESA (Technological University of Santiago). Conducting seminars and conferences PUCAMM (Pontifical Catholic Mother and Teacher University). Seminars and conferences. UNIBE (Ibero-American University). Seminars and conferences. UNAPEC (APEC University). Seminars and conferences
Estonia	ICOMOS estonia.icomos.org Estonian Academy of Arts artun.ee Museum of Estonian Architecture arhitektuurimuuseum.ee Estonian Centre for Architecture https://eestiarkhitektuur.ee/ Estonian Architects Union arhliit.ee
Finland	Alvar Aalto Foundation (www.alvaraalto.fi) Aalto heritage, Museum with national responsibility DOCOMOMO Suomi-Finland ry (www.docomomo.fi) Finnish chapter of Docomomo ICOMOS Finland (https://icomos.fi/) Finnish chapter of Icomos Pro Sunila ry (https://www.alvaraaltosunila.fi/en/frontpage) Sunila housing area residents' society, very active locally Rakennustaiteen seura ry / Finnish Architectural Society (https://rakennustaiteenseura.fi/) national society focusing of built heritage of all ages
France	Regional or departmental Docomomo representation. Very unevenly distributed across the country, active in Royan and the PACA region. Docomomo France: created in 1991, the association brings together people from a wide variety of backgrounds, driven by their commitment to the promotion and protection of 20th-century architecture, town planning and landscapes, and operating in France as part of an international network of expertise, federated by the NGO Docomomo International. The work of the CAUE (Conseil d'architecture, d'urbanisme et de l'environnement) in each département. The work of professional groups such as the national association of heritage architects and the national association of architects of French buildings. Associations or groups working to defend a specific site, such as the association de défense de la Cité-jardin de Châtenay-Malabry, La Butte Rouge.

	Action by the national group of heritage associations (G7 Patrimoine). The network of Maisons de l'Architecture (particularly in Isère): creation of tour circuits and animated site visits.
Germany	Ostmodern. Netzwerk nachkriegsmoderne Baukunst https://www.ostmodern.org civic group concerned with the heritage of the former GDR SOS Brutalism https://www.sosbrutalism.org/ online platform and database, organized by the German museum for architecture and the private foundation Wüstenrot Stiftung Werkstatt Baukultur Bonn https://baukultur-bonn.de civic group dealing with the post-war heritage of the city of Bonn and beyond
Greece	Docomomo, Monumenta, links above
Hungary	- Ministry of Construction and Transportation https://kormany.hu/epitesi-es-kozlekedesi-miniszterium - responsible for governmental acts - Lechner Knowledge Center https://lechnerkozpont.hu/en - information center for construction and collection of works of postwar state design offices - ICOMOS Hungarian National Committee https://icomos.hu/ - Non-governmental organization on all the field of monument protection - Hungarian Museum of Architecture and Monument Protection Documentation Center https://memmdk.hu/ - collection on architecture and monument preservation works - Budapest History Museum Kiscelli Museum: http://www.kiscellimuzeum.hu/virtualis_leletmentes - collection of personal design works and the art of architecture - FUGA Budapest Architecture Center https://fuga.org.hu/ - exhibition space in the capital documenting 20th and 21st century architecture - Contemporary Architecture Center, https://kek.org.hu/ - Non-governmental organization of common researchers and activities promoting architecture - Association of Hungarian Architects https://meszorg.hu/ - Non-governmental organization of architects promoting architectural culture - Budapest University of Technology and Economics Faculty of Architecture Department for History of Architecture and Monument Preservation: https://eptort.bme.hu/tudastar/1945-utani-epiteszetunk/ - leading collaboration of faculties on postwar architecture
India	A few are given here. The list can be expanded later, if required. a. National Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage (NSC20C), ICOMOS India, focused on advocacy, research, publication and, Heritage@Risk cases of 20C heritage of India. b. Art Deco Mumbai (https://artdecomumbai.com) - Advocates Conservation of Mumbai's Art Deco. Has created an Inventory with an interactive map of locations. c. MODERN HERITAGE - a research, listing and documentation initiative that chronicle the history of modern architecture in India, advocating their value as 'Heritage' that must be protected, and recognized in academic and professional discourses.

Iran	Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Tourism and Handicrafts, Tehran and its state offices Ministry of Roads & Urban Development, Tehran Local Municipalities Universities Professional Groups: The Transitional Period Architectural Group, Tehran The Institute for Study of Tehran - Metropolis, Tehran The Special Interest Groups: The Pelak-be-Pelak Research Group, Tehran DOCOMOMO Iran, Tehran Me'markhaneh Bagh-Shahr Research Institute, Esfahan The Story of Ahvaz Research Group, Khuzestan The Southern Caspian Research Group, Chalous Society of Iranian Architectural Luminaries, Tehran Individuals: Amir BANI MASSOUD Arash TABIBZADEH NOURI Kambiz NAVAEI Leili PAHLAVANZADEH Parissa ESMAEILZADEH Rouholla MOJTAHEDZADEH Nasser GHOBADIAN Mostafa KIANI Behrouz MARBAGHI Negar MANSOURI Shima BOKA
Ireland	ICOMOS Ireland 20th Century Heritage Working Group - https://www.icomos.ie/20th-century-heritage-work-group/#:~:text=Introduction,be%20recognised%20and%20better%20understood. Ulster Architectural Heritage - https://www.ulsterarchitecturalheritage.org.uk/
Israel I	ICOMOS-Israel - provides tours, conferences, listing activities and more https://www.icomos.org.il/ DoCoMoMO Israel - conferences, listing activities, publications Liebling House - multidisciplinary exhibitions and lectures on 20th century architecture and the White City in particular, research lab, guided tours, and workshops. https://www.whitecitycenter.org/ Yad Ben Zvi: tours, courses, publications and a wall art project listing 20th century architectural wall decorations https://ybz.org.il/ Council of conservation for Heritage Sites Israel: conferences, listing activities and tours https://shimur.org/?lang=en Bimkom: Planners for Planning Rights: Reports on threats to the built environment, inclusive of 20th century architecture, HUL and HRL, conferences, tours- emphasis on peripheral settlements, Bedouins and Palestinians https://bimkom.org/ THE AVIE AND SARAH ARENSON BUILT HERITAGE RESEARCH CENTER, Technion IIT, https://architecture.technion.ac.il/research/research-centers/the-avie-and-sarah-arensen-built-heritage-research-center/ Azrieli Architectural Archive, https://www.tamuseum.org.il/en/research/azrieli-architecture-archive/
Italy	Docomomo Italia (https://www.docomomoitalia.it/) Pier Luigi Nervi Project foundation (https://pierluiginervi.org/) IN/ARCH – Istituto Nazionale di Architettura (https://www.inarch.it/)

	General Incorporated Association Yoyogi National Gymnasium. Steering Committee for World Heritage Nomination (G.Y.S.C.) https://gysc.or.jp/en/ The association was formed to promote the nomination of Yoyogi National Gymnasium to be inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List. The association will engage in the following activities to pursue its main objectives: Holding international symposiums for the World Heritage nomination inviting experts worldwide. Providing platforms for debates among experts to exchange opinions on the solid outstanding universal value of the gymnasium to be listed on the World Heritage List. Developing public lectures for wider audiences in cooperation with neighborhood merchants associations, educational organizations, volunteer groups, student associations, and others. Updating the website with news, events, and movements in relation to the association's activities. Businesses necessary to achieve the above objectives. Established on 24 November 2020. Tomioka Silk Mill https://www.tomioka-silk.jp/tomioka-silk-mill/?_ga=2.194109417.557969619.1725757697-2072326137.1725757697
Japan	DOCOMOMO Japan - https://docomomojapan.com/?lang=en
Jordan	1. TURATH for Studies and Design: An architectural/research firm based in Amman, Jordan specializes in heritage conservation and management and in adaptive reuse, conservation management planning, and management. www.turath.jo 2. ICOMOS Jordan (National ICOMOS Committee) - https://icomosjordan.org/
	Architecture and Urbanism Research Centre, AUTC, KTU – research, documentation. https://autc.lt/en/home/ (Post)Authoritarian Landscapes Research Centre, VU, Faculty of History – research, thematic conferences https://www.if.vu.lt/naujienos1/renginiai/2183-tarptutinis-post-autoritariu-krastovaizdzu-tyrimo-centro-seminaras-2024-01-31seminaras https://www.if.vu.lt/naujienos1/2234-call-for-participants-cultural-landscapes-concrete-heritage Vilnius TECH, Faculty of Architecture – research, thematic conferences https://vilniustech.lt/about-university/events/international-conference-imperfect-modernism/73516?eid=366541 Architecture Fund – promotion - https://archfondas.lt/en/
Lithuania	Lithuanian Union of Architects
	Scientific Committee for the Architecture of the 20th Century, A.C.: Institutional Work AMEC: Dissemination of the values of 20th century architecture; holding training workshops on how to maintain the authenticity of 20th century buildings; workshops for business plans to take advantage of good 20th century architecture; preservation of libraries and archives of 20th century architects in Mexico.
Mexico	FUNDARQMX: Dissemination and knowledge through visits of important 20th century works in Mexico.
	https://bacu.ro/ -prepare documentation for inclusion of 20c properties in heritage list -prepare the list of potential 20c heritage sites for inclusion in heritage list -organize activities to promote 20c heritage in society life
Moldova	
	Association Casamemoire https://www.casamemoire.org Mamma https://mammagroup.org Association Turath pour le patrimoine de Marrakech Save cinemas in Morocco Fès Mémoire
Morocco	
Nepal	ICOMOS Nepal and Society of Nepalese Architects (SONA).
New Zealand	Docomomo NZ https://www.docomomo.org.nz/about/docomomo-new-zealand/
Nigeria	National Commission for Museums and Monuments State Ministries for Arts and Culture

North Macedonia	The National Conservation centres are authorised for the conservation works on all type of cultural heritage in North Macedonia, regardless of the period when they were built. Here are the ones that have websites: • NI National conservation centre - Skopje http://heritage.gov.mk • NI Conservation centre – Skopje https://www.nukcs.mk However, there are several other institutions and groups working on promotion and recognition of the architecture of the 20th century worth mentioning: FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE SKOPJE, SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS UNIVERSITY IN SKOPJE Established in 1949 where the most prominent Macedonian and Yugoslavian architects that took part in rebuilding of post-earthquake Skopje and creating 20th century architectural trends were professors of many generations of students. http://www.arh.ukim.edu.mk/index.php/mk/ CONTINEO 2020 - Association of Citizens for The Support and Promotion of Culture, consisted of several prominent Macedonian architects and academics that are documenting, studying and valuing the modernist architectural heritage from the second half of the 20th century on the territory of the Republic of Macedonia. They are authors of the "Atlas of Macedonian Modern Architecture" (not published yet). Link from the exhibition hosting this important research: https://marh.mk/atlas-na-makedonskata-moderna-arhitektura/ WWW.MODERNISM.MK (www.northmacedonia.architectuul.com) - database in process of forming dedicated to Macedonian modern architecture. https://northmacedonia.architectuul.com/search/object:work/sort:updated/ https://architectuul.com/digest/foma-46-rebuilding-a-city MARH - internet portal dedicated on promotion of Macedonian architecture to the general public, through past and present realizations, projects, concepts and ideas. https://marh.mk/ THE MUSEUM OF CONTEMPORARY ART-SKOPJE (MSU) - Founded in 1964 as a result of numerous donations of art works to the city of Skopje coming from artists and institutions from all over the world, the mission of the Museum of Contemporary Art is to nourish and disseminate the values of the modern and contemporary art defining the living culture and society of our times. A recent exhibitions exhibition The Future as a Project – Doxiadis in Skopje commemorates 60 years from the catastrophic earthquake that ruined the city on July 26, 1963, and aimed to bring into the spotlight the extraordinary story of Skopje's reconstruction process. Its particular focus is the role and contribution of the Greek architect and planner Constantinos A. Doxiadis. https://msu.mk/exhibition/the-future-as-a-project-doxiadis-in-skopje/ Among other things, in 2022 they published "Balkan Brutalism #Skopje", which aims to upgrade the knowledge about the Brutalist heritage of Skopje. https://meta.mk/msu-izdade-publikacija-za-brutalistickata-arhitektura-na-skopje/ BRUTALISK - A group of local enthusiasts who create a multimedia concept for re-discovering Skopje, for raising awareness of the most active period of its development, the most impressive buildings, the period of modernity, as well as the brutalist buildings built after the Skopje earthquake.
Norway	There are numerous local interest groups working for individual buildings and places. It isn't really possible to select 10 of these. They typically work to restore whichever heritage property they are concerned with using funding from the Directorate of Cultural Heritage. https://frivillig.no/
Philippines	Heritage Conservation Society is the Philippines' leading heritage advocacy group, celebrating its 25th anniversary this year. ICOMOS Philippines gathers the country's leading professionals in conservation.
Poland	- Stowarzyszenie Architektów Polskich; https://www.sarp.pl/ - Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa, Zespół do spraw dóbr kultury współczesnej; zespol_nid_dkw@nid.pl - Tu było, tu stało; https://www.tubylotustalo.pl/ - Instytut Architektury; https://instytutarchitektury.org/ - PKN ICOMOS; http://www.icomos-poland.org/en/
Portugal	• UNESCO Chair "Heritage Cities and Landscapes. Sustainable Management, Conservation, Planning and Design", hosted at the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Porto (link: < https://sigarra.up.pt/faup/pt/web_base.gera_pagina?p_pagina=18304>) • DOCOMOMO Portugal (link: < https://www.docomomo.pt/>) • APRUP - Associação Portuguesa para a Reabilitação Urbana e Proteção do Património (Portuguese Association for the Urban Rehabilitation and Protection of Heritage). (link: < https://aprupp.org/>)

	• SPEHC - Sociedade Portuguesa de Estudos de História de Construção (Portuguese Society for Construction History Studies). (link: < https://spehc.pt/>).
Romania	http://www.icomos.ro/ https://bacu.ro/ https://patrimoniu.ro/
Russian Federation	Leading national and regional organisations involved in 20th century heritage protection and conservation: Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation; Moscow Department of Cultural Heritage; Saint Petersburg Committee for State Control, Use and Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments, and other numerous regional state institutions of the same profile. Main research centres, working groups and task forces: State Institute of Art Studies, Moscow Sector of monuments of architecture and monumental art https://sias.ru/institute/departments/35.html Field research, documentation and publication, including on 20th century architectural monuments and industrial heritage. Schusev Museum of Architecture, Moscow https://muar.ru/ Preservation, research and publication of an outstanding graphic archive on heritage sites of the twentieth century. Melnikov's Museum is within this structure https://muar.ru/dom-melnikova/ All-Russian Society for the Protection of Monuments (VOOPiK) https://voopik.ru/ Voluntary public organization with financial independence and operating in most of the country. The protection includes also some 20th century architectural monuments. Union of Architects of Russia https://uar.ru/ Holds annual festivals "Architecture" and "Architectural Heritage", promotes the values of 20th century heritage Public voluntary movement "Arkhnadzor" https://www.arkhnadzor.ru/ Voluntary association of citizens who want to contribute to the preservation of historical monuments, landscapes and views of Moscow The Constructivist project http://theconstructivistproject.com/ru Documentation and preservation of the legacy of constructivism Shukhov Tower Foundation https://www.shukhovtower.org/ Documentation and preservation of Vladimir Shukhov's legacy Zotov Centre https://centrezotov.ru/ Private institution promoting the legacy of Russian Constructivism.
Saudi Arabia	saudi icomos scientific committee on 20C architectural heritage
Serbia	Docomomo Serbia. Check our website.
Singapore	Docomomo Singapore < https://www.docomomo.sg/ >; Singapore Heritage Society < https://www.facebook.com/sgheritage/videos/252848485557740/ >; ICOMOS Singapore < https://www.icomos-sg.org/ >
Slovenia	ICOMOS Slovenia ISC20C group : http://icomos.splet.arnes.si/files/2021/02/icomos_brosura_Web.pdf DOCOMOMO Slovenia : https://www.docomomo.si Nonument : https://nonument.org ID20 : https://www.id20.si/en/home/ Working group Slovenian industrial Heritage / TICCIH Slovenia : http://slo-ind-ded.si

South Africa	Docomomo SA
Spain	- ICOMOS Spain National Committee. Defense and promotion of cultural heritage. - Docomomo Foundation. Documentation and conservation of the architecture of the modern movement. - Hispania Nostra. Defense, safeguarding and enhancement of cultural and natural heritage through social participation. - INCUNA. Heritage of Industry, culture and nature. - Fundación Arquitectura Contemporánea (Contemporary Architecture Foundation). Dissemination of contemporary architecture. - Salvem el Cabanyal (Save the Cabanyal). Safeguarding a neighborhood in Valencia and architectural relevance of its urban layout. - Madrid, ciudadanía y patrimonio (Madrid, citizenship and heritage). Defense of the cultural, social and natural heritage of the Community of Madrid. - AEPASS (Spanish Association for the Protection of Architectural Heritage of the 20th Century). - AADIPA (Collective of Architects for the Defense and Intervention in Architectural Heritage).
Thailand	- Docomomo Thai (Facebook page Docomomo Thai) - activities: documentation of thai modern heritage, runs the campaign against the demolition of modern heritage such as the Robot building (built in 1986) and the old club house of the Royal Sports Club (built in 1920), organize exhibitions and seminar on modern movement, lectures and talks, give advise for conservation and management to government agency and private sector. - Foto,momo Facebook page: publish documentation online, walking tour - Docomomo Thailand: (www.docomomothai.org) - activity 2014-2019 documentation of modern architecture in Thailand activity - Association of Siamese Architects under Royal Patronage (ASA): - Give awards for architectural conservation projects, give advise about conservation and management to government agency, local authority and private sector. (Not specific to 20th C. Heritage) - ICOMOS Thailand Associations: www.icomosthailand.org - Give advise about conservation and management to government agency, local authority and private sector. (Not specific to 20th C. Heritage) - The Siam Society under Royal Patronage - Organize lectures and talks, cultural tours (Not specific to 20th C. Heritage)
The Netherlands	The following national groups are all devoted to the promotion of identification, protection and renovation/conservation/reuse of built heritage, including 20C buildings and objects: www.bruggenstichting.nl bridges www.brugwachtershuisjes.nl bridge watcher's lodges www.cuypergenootschap.nl built heritage 1850-1970 www.docomomo.nl Modern Movement heritage www.gemalen.nl pumping stations www.heemschut.nl built heritage www.love80sarchitecture.nl built heritage 1970-1990 www.militair-erfgoed.nl military heritage, particularly 20C www.post65.nl built heritage after 1965 They are all run by volunteers; they have websites, organise local or national seminars, meetings and regularly publish, both on-line and on paper. Many also advocate actively for listing and against demolition. Similar groups exist at a regional or local level, and there are also many foundations that run a particular heritage building (often a former church) dating from various periods, including 20C. See also the website of the Federation on Industrial Heritage and its associated organisations (theme-based or region-based): www.fien.nl. They also refer to organisations that deal with the identification and protection of mobile heritage. The association Hendrick de Keyser, with a professional staff, owns, acquires and rents out historic houses and other buildings, mostly with historic interiors and issue on-line and some hard-copy publications on the history and conservation of their houses, including some fine 20C examples of renowned architects. See: www.hendrickdekeyser.nl
Tunisia	ASM de Tunis ; Edifices & Mémoires ; Docomomo (Tunisian section) ; ICOMOS Tunisia ; LAAM : Laboratoire d'Archéologie et d'Architecture Maghrébines (www.laam.tn) ;
Turkey	docomomo Türkiye National Working Party, ICOMOS Türkiye NSC20C, KORDER Conservation and Restoration Specialists' Association, Chamber of Architects of Türkiye, Architectural Restoration & Cultural Property Conservation Association, Architects Association 1927, and Association of Turkish Architects in Private Practice

United States of America	National Trust for Historic Preservation - This organization works to save America's historic places, including modern buildings and landscapes The U.S. State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) - The United State Historic Preservation Offices are responsible for identifying and protecting significant historic buildings, including Modern heritage within their jurisdiction. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP): This federal advisory body provides guidance on historic preservation matters, including Modern architecture, and can review projects impacting significant buildings. The United States General Services Administration (GSA); The GSA actively strategizes its management of modern buildings built between 1950 and 1979. Making up nearly 50% of its inventory, these properties provide unique and challenging opportunities when planning for the future conservation of these distinctive assets. DOCOMOMO US - Dedicated to the documentation and conservation of buildings, sites, and neighborhoods of the modern movement. Los Angeles Conservancy Modern Committee (ModCom) - Focuses on preserving postwar architecture and design in Los Angeles Recent Past Preservation Network - Advocates for the preservation of architecture, sites, and landscapes from the recent past Society of Architectural Historians (SAH) - Promotes the study and preservation of architectural history, including modern architecture Historic New England - Preserves and presents New England heritage, including modernist properties Chicago Bauhaus and Beyond - Focuses on preserving and promoting modernist architecture and design in the Chicago area Mid-Century Modern League - Aims to preserve mid-century modern architecture and design Palm Springs Modern Committee (PS ModCom) - Dedicated to the preservation of modern architecture and design in Palm Springs
Uruguay	Society of Architects of Uruguay Institute of Architectural History Working group for the protection of 20th century architecture heritage of the ORT Faculty of Architecture
Venezuela	1.- Docomomo, Venezuela: It constitutes an official working group in Venezuela for the documentation and international preservation of buildings, sites, and neighborhoods of the Modern Movement. Link: http://docomomovenezuela.blogspot.com/ 2. Fundación para la Cultura Urbana: Founded in 2001, the Fundación para la Cultura Urbana is a non-profit private initiative dedicated to the study of the city, its phenomena, and the dynamics generated in urban environments, as well as disseminating this knowledge. Link: https://cultura-urbana.com/ 3.- Ciudad Laboratorio: It consists of a transdisciplinary team that forms a node for reflection, research, and action, which seeks and promotes the idea of an integrated, sustainable, and safe city in its social, urban, environmental, and economic variables. Link: https://ciudlab.com/ 4. Fundación Villanueva: Led by architect Paulina Villanueva Arismendi, daughter of architect Carlos Raúl Villanueva, it is dedicated to the custody of the architect's archive. Its goal is to disseminate his thoughts and works and preserve the family's residential buildings. 5.- Fundación Alberto Vollmer: The Alberto Vollmer Foundation focuses on preserving the photographic legacy of Alfredo Vollmer, photographer Alfredo Boulton, and the documentary and photographic works of architect Tomás José Sanabria, one of the leading figures in modern architecture in Venezuela. Link: https://fundavollmer.com/

Appendix XII: Guidance Documents on Heritage and Sustainability

<i>Does your country have a policy framework or guidance documents on energy efficiency, sustainability or climate change that directly addresses Twentieth-century heritage? If you selected yes, please provide references</i>	
Abu Dhabi Emirate	https://www.abudhabi.gov.ae/en/programmes/abu-dhabi-climate-change-strategy https://www.mepmiddleeast.com/projects/ades-energy-saving-retrofits
Armenia	Guidance documents on energy efficiency and sustainability refer to all kinds of structures.
Australia	Burra Charter Practice Note Sustainability ; https://australia.icomos.org/publications/historic-environment/he-vol-24-no-2-2012-built-heritage-and-sustainability/ Sustainable Heritage Buildings Guide. NSW Heritage Council https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/research-and-publications/publications-search/sustainable-heritage-buildings-guide Heritage and Climate Change Victoria Heritage Council https://heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/research-guidance/heritage-and-climate-change Eryldene Historic House and Garden Environmental Sustainability Action Plan 2024. https://www.eryldene.org.au/sustainability-at-eryldene
Croatia	Guidelines for energy renovation of the listed buildings https://min-kulture.gov.hr/UserDocImages/dokumenti/.Smjernice%20za%20energetsku%20obnovu%20zgrada%20sa%20statusom%20kulturnog%20dobra.pdf
Finland	<u>Project results: There are options other than demolition – we just need to find them - Ministry of the Environment</u>
Israel	Tel Aviv Municipality "Green Conservation" guidelines: chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.tel-aviv.gov.il/Residents/Development/Documents/%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%A7-%20%D7%94%D7%AA%D7%99%D7%99%D7%A2%D7%9C%D7%95%D7%AA%D7%90%D7%A0%D7%A8%D7%92%D7%98%D7%99%D7%AA%D7%A9%D7%9C%D7%9E%D7%91%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%9D%D7%9C%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A8.pdf general government policy resolutions that could impact 20th Century heritage, for example: https://www.gov.il/he/pages/green_building_government_decisions
Japan	https://www.mlit.go.jp/report/press/house04_hh_001194.html
Singapore	https://www1.bca.gov.sg/buildsg/sustainability/regulatory-requirements-for-existing-buildings
Spain	Guía de buenas prácticas para la instalación de infraestructuras y equipamientos relacionados con las energías renovables y su posible afección al Patrimonio Mundial (Guide to Good Practices for the Installation of Infrastructure and Equipment Related to Renewable Energy and Its Possible Impact on World Heritage). ICOMOS 2022. https://icomos.es/guia-de-buenas-practicas-energias-renovables-y-patrimonio-cultural/

The Netherlands	Heritage agencies of all administrative levels provide additional information, often under the heading 'verduurzaming'. See: Cultureelerfgoed.nl/onderwerpen/duurzaamheid van historische gebouwen Cultureelerfgoed.nl/onderwerpen/energie-en-landschap The national Erfgoedacademie offers various courses but not particularly regarding 20C heritage (e.g. conserving churches, judging construction quality and other modules on conservation and development); see: www.erfgoedacademie.nl The Nationaal Renovatie Platform (NRP), a partner network, offers courses in renovation and transformation of extant buildings, not necessarily listed (20C) heritage buildings. This NRP Academie collaborates therefore with the TU Delft and other institutions. The NRP also issues annual awards for the best projects in these categories, the Gulden Feniks, which often regard 20C buildings. See: www.nrp.nl/gulden-feniks
United States of America	https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/sustainability-guidelines.pdf